

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK

IN RE OPIOID LITIGATION

_____/ No. 400000/2017

-- HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL --

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF ANNA LEMBKE, M.D.

San Francisco, California

Thursday, January 16, 2020

REPORTED BY:

LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR 3462

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK</p> <p>2 COUNTY OF SUFFOLK</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 IN RE OPIOID LITIGATION</p> <p>_____ / No. 400000/2017</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 -- HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL --</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 Videotaped deposition of ANNA LEMBKE, M.D.,</p> <p>13 taken on behalf of Defendants, at the law offices of</p> <p>14 Lief Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, 275 Battery</p> <p>15 Street, Suite 2900, San Francisco, California, beginning</p> <p>16 at 8:06 A.M. and ending at 5:27 P.M., on Thursday,</p> <p>17 January 16, 2020, before Leslie Rockwood Rosas, RPR,</p> <p>18 Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 3462.</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF COUNTY OF NASSAU:</p> <p>4 NAPOLI SHKOLNIK PLLC</p> <p>5 BY: SALVATORE C. BADALA, ESQ. (via speakerphone)</p> <p>6 400 Broadhollow Road, Suite 305</p> <p>7 Melville, New York 11747</p> <p>8 212.397.1000</p> <p>9 sbadala@napolilaw.com</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 FOR THE DEFENDANT JOHNSON & JOHNSON AND JANSSEN:</p> <p>13 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP</p> <p>14 BY: HOUMAN EHSAN, M.D.</p> <p>15 400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor</p> <p>16 Los Angeles, California 90071-2899</p> <p>17 213.430.6326</p> <p>18 hehsan@omm.com</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF:</p> <p>4 LIEFF CABRASER HIEMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP</p> <p>5 BY: DONALD C. ARBITBLIT, ESQ.</p> <p>6 ABBY WOLF, ESQ.</p> <p>7 BRITT CIBULKA, ESQ. (via speakerphone)</p> <p>8 275 Battery Street, Suite 2900</p> <p>9 San Francisco, California 94111-3339</p> <p>10 415.956.1000</p> <p>11 darbitblit@lchb.com</p> <p>12 awolf@lchb.com</p> <p>13 bcibulka@lchb.com</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 STATE OF NEW YORK, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL</p> <p>16 BY: LEO O'TOOLE, ESQ. (via speakerphone)</p> <p>17 200 Old Country Road, Suite 240</p> <p>18 Mineola, New York 11501</p> <p>19 516.248.3302</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE DEFENDANT CARDINALHEALTH:</p> <p>4 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP</p> <p>5 BY: MATTHEW P. MOONEY, ESQ.</p> <p>6 STEVEN M. PYSER, ESQ.</p> <p>7 725 Twelfth Street NW</p> <p>8 Washington, DC 20005</p> <p>9 202.434.5421</p> <p>10 mmooney@wc.com</p> <p>11 spyser@wc.com</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 FOR THE DEFENDANT WALMART:</p> <p>15 JONES DAY</p> <p>16 BY: EDWARD M. CARTER, ESQ.</p> <p>17 325 John H. McConnell Boulevard, Suite 600</p> <p>18 Columbus, Ohio 43215-2673</p> <p>19 614.281.3906</p> <p>20 emcarter@jonesday.com</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE DEFENDANT WALGREENS:</p> <p>4 BARTLIT BECK LLP</p> <p>5 BY: KATHERINE M. SWIFT, ESQ.</p> <p>6 54 West Hubbard Street</p> <p>7 Chicago, Illinois 60654</p> <p>8 312.494.4405</p> <p>9 Katherine.Swift@BartlitBeck.com</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 FOR THE DEFENDANT AMERISOURCEBERGEN:</p> <p>14 REED SMITH</p> <p>15 BY: LUKE PORTER, ESQ.</p> <p>16 101 Second Street, Suite 1800</p> <p>17 San Francisco, California 94105</p> <p>18 415.659.5987</p> <p>19 lporter@reedsmith.com</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE DEFENDANT ALLERGAN FINANCE:</p> <p>4 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP</p> <p>5 BY: MARIA PELLEGRINO RIVERA, ESQ.</p> <p>6 300 North LaSalle</p> <p>7 Chicago, Illinois 60654</p> <p>8 312.8622740</p> <p>9 mrivera@kirkland.com</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 FOR THE DEFENDANT MCKESSON:</p> <p>13 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP</p> <p>14 BY: MEGAN L. RODGERS, ESQ.</p> <p>15 3000 El Camino Real</p> <p>16 5 Palo Alto Square</p> <p>17 Palo Alto, California 94306-2112</p> <p>18 650.632.4734</p> <p>19 mrodgers@cov.com</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE DEFENDANT ENDO PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., ENDO HEALTH</p> <p>4 SOLUTIONS, INC., PAR PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., AND PAR</p> <p>5 PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES:</p> <p>6 ARNOLD & PORTER KAY SCHOLER LLP</p> <p>7 BY: ANGELA R. VICARI, ESQ.</p> <p>8 250 West 55th Street</p> <p>9 New York, New York 10019-9710</p> <p>10 212.836.7408</p> <p>11 angela.vicari@arnoldporter.com</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 FOR THE DEFENDANT MALLINCKRODT:</p> <p>15 ROPES & GRAY LLP</p> <p>16 BY: ROCKY C. TSAI, ESQ.</p> <p>17 Three Embarcadero Center</p> <p>18 San Francisco, California 94111-4006</p> <p>19 415.315.6358</p> <p>20 Rocky.Tsai@ropesgray.com</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE DEFENDANT TEVA AND ACTAVIS AND GENERIC ENTITIES:</p> <p>4 MORGAN & LEWIS</p> <p>5 BY: MARTHA A. LEIBELL, ESQ.</p> <p>6 200 South Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 5300</p> <p>7 Miami, Florida 33131-2339</p> <p>8 305.415.3387</p> <p>9 martha.leibell@morganlewis.com</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 FOR THE DEFENDANT ROCHESTER DRUG COOPERATIVE, INC.:</p> <p>13 ALLEGAERT BERGER & VOGEL</p> <p>14 BY: LAUREN J. PINCUS, ESQ. (via speakerphone)</p> <p>15 111 Broadway, 20th Floor</p> <p>16 New York, New York 10006</p> <p>17 212.616.7057</p> <p>18 lpincus@abv.com</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 Also Present: Sean Grant, Videographer</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

3 (Pages 6 - 9)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 10				Page 12			
1	I N D E X			1	Exhibit 13	ALLERGAN_MDL_01361692 - 1850	285
2				2	Exhibit 14	WIS_PPSG_003892	286
3				3			
4	THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2020			4			
5				5			
6	WITNESS	EXAMINATION		6			
7	ANNA LEMBKE, M.D.			7			
8	BY MR. MOONEY	16		8			
9	BY MR. CARTER	127		9			
10	BY MR. TSAI	167		10			
11	BY MR. EHSAN	251		11			
12	BY MS. VICARI	272		12			
13	BY MS. RIVERA	286		13			
14	BY MS. LEIBELL	301		14			
15	BY MS. RODGERS	310		15			
16				16			
17				17			
18				18			
19	QUESTIONS WITNESS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER:			19			
20	PAGE	LINE		20			
	21	18		21			
21	50	25		22			
	52	21		23			
22	55	18		24			
23				25			
24							
25							

Page 11				Page 13			
1	DEPOSITION EXHIBITS			1	San Francisco, California; Thursday, January 16, 2020		
2	ANNA LEMBKE, M.D.			2	8:06 A.M.		
3				3	PROCEEDINGS		
4	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	4	--oOo--		
5	Exhibit 1	Court Order, Hon. Jerry	13	5	(Exhibit 1, Court Order, Hon. Jerry Garguilo,		
6		Garguilo, 1/14/20		6	1/14/20, marked for identification.)		
7	Exhibit 2	Expert Report, Anna Lembke,	13	7	(Exhibit 2, Expert Report, Anna Lembke, M.D.,		
8		M.D., 12/19/19		8	12/19/19, marked for identification.)		
9	Exhibit 3	Supplemental Materials	67	9	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We're on the		
10		Considered List, Dr. Anna		10	record. The time is 8:06 a.m. The date is January 16,		
11		Lembke		11	2020.		
12	Exhibit 4	CBHSQ Date Review, SAMHSA,	119	12	This begins the videotaped deposition of		
13		August 2013		13	Dr. Anna Lembke, M.D. This deposition is being taken on		
14	Exhibit 5	Dr. Lembke binder, notes and	126	14	behalf of counsel for defendants, In Re Opioid		
15		notations		15	Litigation.		
16	Exhibit 6	Opioid Use Disorder, DSM-5,	154	16	This case is filed in the Superior Court of the		
17		page 543		17	State of New York, County of Suffolk, Index Number		
18	Exhibit 7	Pre-roll: Mischa intro	236	18	400000/2017.		
19	Exhibit 8	Handwritten notes, 1/16/14	238	19	This deposition is being held at Lieff Cabraser		
20	Exhibit 9	JAN-MS-00362490	250	20	Hiemann & Bernstein in San Francisco, California.		
21	Exhibit 10	Highlights of Prescribing	250	21	My name is Sean Grant from the firm Veritext.		
22		Information		22	I'm the videographer, and the court reporter is Leslie		
23	Exhibit 11	JAN-MS-00362490	250	23	Rockwood, also from Veritext.		
24	Exhibit 12	Highlights of Prescribing	250	24	Please note that audio and video recording will		
25		Information		25	take place unless all parties have agreed to go off the		

4 (Pages 10 - 13)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 record. Microphones are sensitive and may pick up 2 whispers, private conversations or cell interference. 3 (Telephonic interruption.) 4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Would all present in the room 5 please identify themselves and state whom they represent. 6 Counsel. 7 MR. MOONEY: Matthew Mooney, Williams & 8 Connolly, for CardinalHealth. And next to me is Steve 9 Pyser, also of Williams & Connolly. 10 MR. EHSAN: Houman Ehsan, O'Melveny & Myers, on 11 behalf of Johnson & Johnson and Janssen. 12 MR. CARTER: Ed Carter for Walmart. 13 MS. SMITH: Kate Swift for Walgreens. 14 MR. PORTER: Luke Porter, Reed Smith, on behalf 15 of AmerisourceBergen. 16 MS. VICARI: Angela Vicari from Arnold & Porter 17 for ENDO Pharmaceuticals, Inc., ENDO Health Solutions, 18 Inc., Par Pharmaceutical, Inc., and Par Pharmaceutical 19 Companies. 20 MR. TSAI: Rocky Tsai, Ropes & Gray, for 21 Mallinckrodt. 22 MS. RIVERA: Maria Rivera from Kirkland & Ellis 23 on behalf of Allergan Finance. 24 MS. RODGERS: Megan Rodgers, with Covington & 25 Burling, on behalf of McKesson.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 Hiemann & Bernstein, on behalf of plaintiffs. 2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Anyone else? Thank you. 3 Would the Certified Court Reporter please swear 4 in the witness. 5 THE REPORTER: Would you raise your right hand, 6 please. 7 You do solemnly state that the evidence you 8 shall give in this matter shall be the truth, the whole 9 truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 11 THE REPORTER: Thank you. 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel. 13 EXAMINATION 14 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Good morning, Dr. Lembke. 15 A. Good morning. 16 Q. Before we get started, I just want to put on the 17 record that on January 14th of this month, the Court 18 entered a short form order that concerns the conduct of 19 expert depositions, and I've spoken to your counsel here 20 and he assured me that he's aware of the order. 21 And so we've been instructed to place the order 22 from Justice Garguilo on the record, and so I'm going to 23 offer that as Exhibit 1 to your deposition. 24 Would you please state your name for the record. 25 A. Anna Lembke.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 MS. LEIBELL: Martha Leibell of Morgan & Lewis 2 for the Teva and Actavis generic entities. 3 MS. WOLF: Abby Wolf on behalf of plaintiffs. 4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Don Arbitblit, Lieff Cabraser 5 Hiemann & Bernstein, for plaintiffs. 6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Is there anybody appearing 7 telephonically? 8 MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. Leo O'Toole, from the Office 9 of the New York State Attorney General on behalf of 10 plaintiff. 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay, Leo O'Toole? One more 12 time, Leo. 13 MR. O'TOOLE: Leo O'Toole, from the Office of 14 the New York State Attorney General, on behalf of 15 plaintiff. 16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. 17 Next? Anyone else? 18 MR. BADALA: Sal Badala -- Sal Badala from 19 Napoli Shkolnik on behalf of Nassau County. 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Is that it? Thank you. 21 MS. PINCUS: Lauren Pincus -- oh -- Lauren 22 Pincus, from Allegaert Berger & Vogel, on behalf of 23 defendant Rochester Drug Cooperative, Inc. 24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Anyone else? 25 MS. CIBULKA: Britt Cibulka, from Lieff Cabraser</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 Q. And you are a professor at Stanford University 2 School of Medicine; is that right? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. What is your current title at Stanford? 5 A. I'm an associate professor. I'm medical 6 director of addiction medicine. I'm program director of 7 our addiction medicine fellowship, and I'm chief of our 8 addiction medicine dual diagnosis clinic. I also have a 9 courtesy appointment in the Department of Anesthesia 10 Pain. 11 Q. And how long have you taught at Stanford? 12 A. I've been teaching at Stanford for over 13 20 years. 14 Q. And would you please briefly walk through your 15 educational background. 16 A. I did my undergraduate at Yale University, 17 graduating summa cum laude, Bachelor's in humanities. I 18 then attended Stanford Medical School, where I graduated 19 with an M.D. in 1995. 20 I then completed a residency in psychiatry in 21 2000 and did a fellowship in mood disorders in the early 22 aughts at the same time that I joined as junior faculty 23 at Stanford, and I've been there on faculty at the 24 university and the School of Medicine since that time. 25 Q. And you were retained by the plaintiffs to</p>

5 (Pages 14 - 17)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 provide an expert report in this litigation; is that 2 correct? 3 A. That is correct. 4 Q. And did you create such a report? 5 A. Yes, I did. 6 Q. I'm going to show you what's been marked as 7 Exhibit 2 to your deposition. Would you please take a 8 moment to look at it. 9 A. (Witness complies.) 10 Q. Would you please identify what's been handed to 11 you as Exhibit 2? 12 A. This is my expert report, which I submitted on 13 December 19, 2019, in this litigation. 14 Q. And does the report that's been identified as 15 Exhibit 2 contain the opinions you intend to offer in 16 this litigation? 17 A. It's a long report so it's hard for me to assess 18 whether it's exactly what I submitted, but I assume that 19 it is, and yes, it appears to contain my opinions. 20 Q. I will represent to you that this is -- I 21 printed the PDF that we received from plaintiffs. So 22 assuming that's true, does it contain the opinions you 23 intend to offer in this litigation? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. And does this report contain a comprehensive</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 Q. You've been paid more than \$20,000 by the 2 plaintiffs in the New York litigation so far; is that 3 correct? 4 A. I'm not sure. 5 Q. How much do you think you have been paid by the 6 plaintiffs in the New York litigation so far? 7 A. I think it is more than \$20,000 so far. 8 Q. Now, you also submitted a report in the Federal 9 multi-district litigation; is that correct? 10 A. Yes, I did. 11 Q. Did the plaintiffs in the Federal opioid 12 litigation also pay you for your time? 13 A. Yes, they did. 14 Q. The plaintiffs in the Federal opioid litigation 15 paid you more than \$200,000 for your opinions; is that 16 correct? 17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection to form. 18 And just to clarify, is this a reciprocal -- 19 have there been any agreements you're aware of as far as 20 providing evidence on both sides as to what experts have 21 been paid? Because if not, I'll object and instruct not 22 to answer until there's -- there is an agreement. 23 MR. MOONEY: We received the expert -- or the 24 invoices from Dr. Lembke's Federal District case -- or 25 Federal litigation. I'm just confirming that the numbers</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 explanation of the opinions you intend to offer in this 2 litigation? 3 A. It does contain my opinions, yes. 4 Q. And is it a comprehensive set of your opinions? 5 A. What do you mean by "comprehensive"? 6 Q. Well, are there other opinions that you didn't 7 offer in your report that you intend to offer in this 8 litigation? 9 A. No. 10 Q. When did the plaintiffs in this case retain you 11 as an expert? 12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection. Just to clarify -- 13 and I won't do speaking objections, but we're going back 14 to the MDL or do you mean New York? 15 MR. MOONEY: In New York. I'll clarify. Just 16 for everyone, I'll clarify when I'm talking about the 17 Federal litigation. 18 THE WITNESS: I was first approached in November 19 of 2019 to be an expert witness in this litigation. 20 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Are you paid by the hour? 21 A. Yes, I am. 22 Q. What is your hourly rate? 23 A. \$500 per hour. 24 Q. And how about for your time testifying? 25 A. \$800 per hour.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 that are on that invoice are what she was paid. 2 MR. ARBITBLIT: I'll still object to the form of 3 the question, but you can answer. 4 THE WITNESS: I must admit I have not added it 5 up so I don't know the exact amount. 6 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Can you provide an estimate of 7 how much the plaintiffs paid you in the Federal 8 litigation for your opinion? 9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 10 THE WITNESS: I really don't know. 11 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Have you received any other 12 payments from plaintiffs in other opioid-related 13 litigation? 14 A. Yes, I have. 15 Q. Who -- who has paid you in other opioid 16 litigation? 17 A. The State of Washington. 18 Q. And how much has the State of Washington paid 19 you? 20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 21 And again, if there's reciprocal agreement that 22 all payments to defense experts are fair game and will be 23 answered, then I'll allow the witness to answer. If not, 24 I'll instruct her not to. 25 And that goes for everyone around the table. If</p>

6 (Pages 18 - 21)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 there's an agreement, she can answer; if there isn't, she 2 won't.</p> <p>3 MR. PYSER: I'll jump in. This is Steven Pyser. 4 The question pending, we can talk off-line -- 5 there's a lot of defendants -- about whether there's 6 agreements across all of the cases. To my knowledge, 7 there's not. But there is no sound basis for an 8 objection here.</p> <p>9 The question's pending. It's a simple question. 10 There's no basis not to -- to instruct not to answer.</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: I disagree. We don't -- we 12 don't agree with that.</p> <p>13 Don't answer.</p> <p>14 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Turn to page 5 and 6 of your 15 report.</p> <p>16 Dr. Lembke, are you going to follow your 17 counsel's advice not to answer the question?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>19 Q. On pages 5 and 6, you'll see a series of nine 20 opinions.</p> <p>21 Do you see that?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>23 Q. On page 6, paragraph 9: "Today's opioid crisis 24 would not have occurred without the paradigm shift that 25 contributed in overprescribing an excessive supply of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 to every region in the country and readily dispensed. 2 Q. What is the paradigm shift in the distributor 3 supply chain?</p> <p>4 A. The paradigm shift in the distributor supply 5 chain is the collaboration between distributors and 6 pharmacies and opioid manufacturers that led to a massive 7 increase in the number of pills, putting the population 8 at risk.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you have any expertise in supply chain 10 management?</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the path of 13 opioid pills from manufacturers to distributors to 14 pharmacies to patients. I've spent the last 20 years as 15 a practicing physician. I've also researched the opioid 16 epidemic.</p> <p>17 And so based on that, I do have expertise in 18 understanding how that supply chain has contributed to 19 the oversupply of opioids.</p> <p>20 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Have you ever worked in a 21 pharmaceutical wholesale distributor?</p> <p>22 A. No I have not.</p> <p>23 Q. Have you ever worked in a pharmacy?</p> <p>24 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>25 Q. Have you ever worked for a pharmaceutical</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 opioids, which together contributed to the scourge of 2 addiction and death."</p> <p>3 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Would you read paragraph 9.</p> <p>6 A. "Today's opioid crisis would not have occurred 7 without the paradigm shift that resulted in 8 overprescribing an excessive supply of opioids, which 9 together contributed to the scourge of addiction and 10 death."</p> <p>11 Q. And is it your opinion that today's opioid 12 crisis would not have occurred without a paradigm shift 13 that resulted in overprescribing an excessive supply of 14 opioids?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, that is my opinion.</p> <p>16 Q. When you say "the paradigm shift" in paragraph 17 9, what are you referring to?</p> <p>18 A. I'm referring to a change in our society leading 19 to massive oversupply of opioids, putting the population 20 at risk.</p> <p>21 Q. And is that paradigm shift a paradigm shift in 22 the treatment of pain?</p> <p>23 A. That paradigm shift included both a shift in the 24 treatment of pain as well as an efficient distributor 25 supply chain that enabled those pills to be distributed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 manufacturer?</p> <p>2 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>3 Q. Have you ever taken coursework in supply chain 4 management?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Have you taken -- are you -- have you taken any 7 coursework relating to pharmaceutical distributors' 8 regulatory responsibilities?</p> <p>9 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you have any -- have you taken any coursework 11 regarding the wholesale distribution of controlled 12 substances?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you have any expertise concerning the 15 regulatory responsibilities rela- -- excuse me. Strike 16 that.</p> <p>17 Do you have any expertise concerning the 18 monitoring of suspicious orders by pharmacies?</p> <p>19 A. I do have expertise in the sense that I am aware 20 that the failure to scrutinize the distribution of opioid 21 pills in large volumes has contributed to the current 22 opioid epidemic.</p> <p>23 Q. And what is that awareness based on?</p> <p>24 A. That's based on reports of billions of pills 25 being disseminated across this country, including to</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 small towns consisting of no more than 10,000 citizens, 2 amounts of pills that could never possibly be justified 3 by the need for analgesia in that community. 4 Q. Anything else? 5 A. It's also based on my clinical experience over 6 20 years observing the increased supply leading to ready 7 access, an endangerment of individuals due to that 8 increased supply, increasing their vulnerability to 9 addiction and accidental overdose death. 10 Q. Anything else? 11 A. Could you repeat the question? 12 Q. Anything else? 13 A. Could you repeat the root question? 14 Q. What is the -- what is your awareness of the 15 failure to scrutinize the distribution of opioid pills in 16 large volumes that has contributed to the opioid 17 epidemic? 18 A. My awareness also comes from reports that have 19 been issued on ARCOS data and DEA supply-chain data. 20 Q. Anything else? 21 A. My awareness is also based on knowledge of pill 22 mills. 23 Q. Can you identify any pill mills in the state of 24 New York? 25 A. I'm not aware of any pill mills in the state of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 So the NASEM report, which I refer to on page 12 2 of my report, found that diversion is a key contributor 3 to increased exposure to prescription opioids, and I'm 4 quoting here from the NASEM report, quote: "DEA reports 5 that in recent years distributors in the United States 6 dispersed 12 to 15 billion dosage units of opioid 7 narcotics to retail-level purchasers, suggesting that 8 total diversion is on the order of 2.5 to 4 billion 9 dosage units," unquote. 10 Also a Washington Post analysis of Federal ARCOS 11 data shows that from 2006 to 2012, approximately 12 76 billion oxycodone and hydrocodone pills were delivered 13 in the United States. 14 And if we were to assume the same rate of 15 diversion as from the NASEM report, that would represent 16 diversion on the order of 12 to 19 billion pills during 17 the six-year period from 2006 to 2012. 18 There was also a more recent Washington Post 19 report adding the years 2013 and 2014, bringing that 20 total number of disbursed pills up to 100 billion pills. 21 And that's based on ARCOS data. 22 Q. How many -- 23 A. Oh, sorry. I was just going to say, I also base 24 my opinion on the impact of distribution on the opioid 25 epidemic on studies showing that in regions in the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 New York. 2 Q. Have you conducted any independent analysis 3 relating to the failure to scrutinize the distribution of 4 opioid pills in large volumes? 5 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 6 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by "independent 7 analysis"? 8 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Well, you said that you're aware 9 of reports from ARCOS data or reports on the number of 10 pills that have been shipped. 11 My question is: Have you done any of your own 12 analysis to reach a conclusion about the distribution of 13 opioids? 14 A. I have not done my own numeric analysis of those 15 data. 16 Q. You were relying on what you have read in 17 newspaper reports? 18 A. Newspaper reports and other reports as well. 19 Q. Okay. What other reports? 20 A. I'd like to refer to my report. 21 Q. Are you not familiar, sitting here today, with 22 the contents of your report? 23 A. I'm very familiar, but this is a very serious 24 proceeding and I want to be as accurate as I possibly 25 can.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 United States where more pills were disbursed were also 2 regions that saw increased rates of harm due to opioid, 3 including opioid addiction overdose deaths. 4 And I do refer to that in my report, and I'd 5 like to find that reference and also include it in my 6 response. 7 So on page 85 of my report, I talk about how 8 based on an article by Ghertner, et al., that: "ARCOS 9 data on opioid prescribing shows a 9-percent increase in 10 opioid hospitalizations for each 1 morphine kilogram 11 equivalent increase in opioid sales at the county level. 12 These data demonstrate a clear and convincing geographic 13 specific link between opioid dispensing and 14 opioid-related harm." 15 Q. Opioid prescribed -- this paragraph E references 16 opioid prescribing; is that right? 17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 18 THE WITNESS: It references opioid sales at the 19 county level. 20 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: In paragraph E of page 85: 21 "ARCOS data on opioid prescribing showing 9-percent 22 increase in opioid-related hospitalizations for each 23 1 morphine kilogram equivalent increase in opioid sales 24 at the county level." 25 Is that right?</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 A. Yes, that's right.</p> <p>2 Q. And do you agree that opioid sales from a</p> <p>3 pharmacy would not -- do not happen without a</p> <p>4 prescription?</p> <p>5 A. Pharmacies also have a responsibility in the</p> <p>6 opioid supply chain to make sure that patient consumers</p> <p>7 are not being harmed by the opioids that are dispensed.</p> <p>8 So although I would agree that pharmacies cannot dispense</p> <p>9 opioids without a prescription, I would qualify that to</p> <p>10 say that they also have a responsibility to patient</p> <p>11 consumers to ensure that it's an appropriate prescription</p> <p>12 and that it's a true prescription, it's not a</p> <p>13 prescription that will harm the patient.</p> <p>14 Pharmacists do have a responsibility, for</p> <p>15 example, to check drug interactions to check relative</p> <p>16 contraindications.</p> <p>17 Pharmacists play an important role in educating</p> <p>18 their patients about the risks and benefits of the</p> <p>19 medications they're dispensing. So pharmacists are not</p> <p>20 merely in a passive role of turning over opioids or other</p> <p>21 medications when they get a prescription. They have also</p> <p>22 a health-safety relationship to their patients.</p> <p>23 MR. CARTER: This is Ed Carter.</p> <p>24 I move to strike everything in that response</p> <p>25 other than "I would agree pharmacies cannot dispense</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 prescribed opioids?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And you say that that change was radical?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. What do you mean by there was a radical change</p> <p>6 in the way that doctors treated pain?</p> <p>7 A. Prior to 1980, doctors used opioids sparingly</p> <p>8 for acute pain for people in extreme agony and at the end</p> <p>9 of life. Starting in the 1980s, particularly in the</p> <p>10 1990s, that paradigm changed such that opioids became</p> <p>11 first-line treatment for even minor and chronic pain</p> <p>12 conditions.</p> <p>13 Q. Does that mean that a responsible physician</p> <p>14 trying to act in good faith in treating his or her</p> <p>15 patients would have prescribed opioids more often than in</p> <p>16 the past?</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: What it means is that several</p> <p>19 generations of physicians were misled in terms of what</p> <p>20 the science showed regarding safety and efficacy of</p> <p>21 opioids, and in believing that they were prescribing</p> <p>22 according to good science, they began to prescribe</p> <p>23 opioids for minor and chronic pain conditions in a</p> <p>24 departure from past practice.</p> <p>25 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: And that departure was that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 opioids without a prescription."</p> <p>2 MR. MOONEY: And I will just repeat the</p> <p>3 question, understanding you have a caveat.</p> <p>4 Q. My question was -- was simpler: Do you agree</p> <p>5 that opioid sales from a pharmacy do not happen without a</p> <p>6 prescription?</p> <p>7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I agree, with the caveat stated</p> <p>9 previously.</p> <p>10 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: If you could turn to page 13 of</p> <p>11 your report. Paragraph 2: "Opioid prescribing began --</p> <p>12 began to increase in the 1980s, became prolific in the</p> <p>13 1990s and the early part of the 21st century,</p> <p>14 representing a radical paradigm shift in the treatment of</p> <p>15 pain and creating more access to opioids across the</p> <p>16 United States."</p> <p>17 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, you did.</p> <p>19 Q. Is that the opinion that you have in this case?</p> <p>20 A. That is one of nine opinions that I have in this</p> <p>21 case.</p> <p>22 Q. And so prior to 1980, doctors used opioid pain</p> <p>23 relievers sparingly; is that right?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And then there was a change in how doctors</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 opioids would be prescribed more frequently than in the</p> <p>2 past; is that correct?</p> <p>3 A. That's correct.</p> <p>4 Q. Is it your opinion that the change in medical</p> <p>5 practice toward liberal opioid prescribing has been a</p> <p>6 major factor contributing to the increased supply which</p> <p>7 has fueled the opioid epidemic?</p> <p>8 A. It's my opinion that the change in opioid</p> <p>9 prescribing has been a major factor, but not the only</p> <p>10 factor. Another major factor has been an efficient</p> <p>11 distributor supply chain as well as the problem of</p> <p>12 diversion of opioids through various means.</p> <p>13 Q. Is it your understanding that pharmaceutical</p> <p>14 distributors ship prescription drugs to pharmacies when a</p> <p>15 pharmacy places an order for those drugs?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, that is my understanding.</p> <p>17 Q. Is it your understanding that pharmacies order</p> <p>18 prescription drugs from distributors based on the</p> <p>19 pharmacy's expected demand?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, that's my understanding.</p> <p>21 Q. And in the case of prescription drugs, a</p> <p>22 pharmacy's expected demand will depend on how many</p> <p>23 customers come to the pharmacy with a doctor's</p> <p>24 prescription for those drugs, doesn't it?</p> <p>25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I'm actually not that familiar</p> <p>2 with what the pharmacies base their orders on.</p> <p>3 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Do you have any understanding of</p> <p>4 pharmacy inventory management practices?</p> <p>5 A. That's not my area, no.</p> <p>6 Q. You keep referencing an efficient supply chain,</p> <p>7 but no matter how efficient the supply chain is, without</p> <p>8 a prescription, those pills are just going to sit on the</p> <p>9 shelf, aren't they?</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: The efficient distributor supply</p> <p>12 chain has played a major role in this epidemic. Without</p> <p>13 the massive distribution of opioid pain pills to every</p> <p>14 geographic region in the United States, this epidemic</p> <p>15 would have been much less likely to occur and perhaps may</p> <p>16 not have occurred at all.</p> <p>17 So what your question assumes is that the</p> <p>18 distributors are just innocently fulfilling orders, that</p> <p>19 they're just the trucks, and that's not really an</p> <p>20 accurate representation. Because they, too, have a</p> <p>21 responsibility in scrutinizing suspicious orders and</p> <p>22 being vigilant stewards of highly lethal drugs that</p> <p>23 they're distributing and dispensing across the country.</p> <p>24 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: These highly lethal drugs, these</p> <p>25 are the opioids you're talking about?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 a blind eye to that problem and sought to hide behind the</p> <p>2 other and say it was somebody else's responsibility, when</p> <p>3 in fact they all had a responsibility. But the money</p> <p>4 was, you know, so appealing, that these various agencies</p> <p>5 in the opioid distributor supply chain failed to meet</p> <p>6 their stewardship responsibility vis-à-vis the American</p> <p>7 public.</p> <p>8 Q. What's the basis for your statement that there</p> <p>9 was collusion among the members of the supply chain?</p> <p>10 A. One small example is I believe that some of the</p> <p>11 distributors, for example, created coupons for free</p> <p>12 samples of opioids that patients could get.</p> <p>13 Q. Where is that in your report?</p> <p>14 A. That is not in my report.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. What documents are you relying on to</p> <p>16 support the belief that distributors created coupons for</p> <p>17 free samples of opioids?</p> <p>18 A. I've seen documents showing that McKesson</p> <p>19 created coupons for free samples of Nucynta.</p> <p>20 Q. Anything else?</p> <p>21 A. No. But the practice of kind of promotional</p> <p>22 efforts and free coupons and a general collusion between</p> <p>23 these individuals is something that I feel I have seen in</p> <p>24 my more than 20 years of medical practice.</p> <p>25 I would also add that opioids are unique from</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 A. That's right.</p> <p>2 Q. And those are FDA-approved drugs?</p> <p>3 A. Yes, they are.</p> <p>4 Q. And the FDA, even today in 2020, allows opioids</p> <p>5 to be prescribed to patients; is that right?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, it does.</p> <p>7 Q. And is there anything about the efficient supply</p> <p>8 chain that is unique to opioids as opposed to any of the</p> <p>9 other numerous drugs that distributors distribute to</p> <p>10 pharmacies?</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Yes, I think so.</p> <p>13 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: What is unique about the opioid</p> <p>14 supply chain that makes it efficient?</p> <p>15 A. One thing that is unique to the opioid supply</p> <p>16 chain is the way that all of the actors from</p> <p>17 manufacturers to distributors to pharmacies, benefitted</p> <p>18 from the actions of the others in terms of increasing</p> <p>19 demand and increasing supply.</p> <p>20 Q. How is that unique to opioids as opposed to any</p> <p>21 other pharmaceutical product?</p> <p>22 A. Because in the case of opioids, there was</p> <p>23 collusion around the fact that people were becoming</p> <p>24 addicted and dying from these opioids, and yet the opioid</p> <p>25 pharmaceutical industry turned the other cheek or turned</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 other medications because of their highly addictive</p> <p>2 potential and their lethality and the fact that they</p> <p>3 create a serious dependent syndrome that drives ongoing</p> <p>4 use, even beyond utility or safety or efficacy.</p> <p>5 So I do think that the pharmaceutical industry</p> <p>6 that is involved in opioids has a responsibility above</p> <p>7 and beyond what might be there even for other types of</p> <p>8 medications that are not as addictive and not as lethal.</p> <p>9 Q. You say the money was so appealing. What's the</p> <p>10 profit margin for opioids for a pharmaceutical</p> <p>11 distributor?</p> <p>12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I can't give you specific numbers,</p> <p>14 but my sense is that it's a billion-dollar industry.</p> <p>15 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: And what is that based on?</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: That's based on my reading in the</p> <p>17 public domain.</p> <p>18 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: And what are distributors'</p> <p>19 profits from this so-called billion-dollar industry?</p> <p>20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I'm not familiar with specific</p> <p>22 numbers regarding profits.</p> <p>23 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: So how do you know that the</p> <p>24 money was so appealing that it caused the distributors to</p> <p>25 look the other way?</p>

10 (Pages 34 - 37)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 A. Because I am aware that this is a 2 billion-dollar -- a multi-billion-dollar industry. 3 Q. You also say that you said you think the 4 pharmaceutical industry that is involved in opioids has a 5 responsibility above and beyond what there might be even 6 for other types of medications. What do you mean by "a 7 responsibility above and beyond"? 8 A. Opioids, in a sense, sell themselves because of 9 their addictive potential. So I believe that when it 10 comes to the opioid pharmaceutical industry, they need to 11 be especially vigilant about the problem of opioid 12 addiction overdose death beyond what they would need to 13 be for a non-addictive medication or even an addictive 14 medication that is not an opioid. I think opioids are 15 unique in this way. 16 Q. And what would that especially vigilant, what 17 would that look like? 18 A. That would look like being very, very vigilant 19 regarding regions of the country that -- and pharmacies 20 that are ordering especially high volumes of opioids and 21 very closely scrutinizing those pharmacies in those 22 regions to determine whether or not diversion is 23 occurring or whether or not the citizens in that 24 community are being harmed by the opioids that they are 25 ingesting.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 Q. When there was a change in the way in which 2 doctors prescribed opioids, was that change limited to a 3 specific type of doctor? 4 A. No, that was a paradigm shift across all medical 5 specialties. 6 Q. And by volume, did the family medicine doctors 7 and internal medicine doctors account for most of the 8 opioids that were prescribed? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. And so as you analyzed it in your 2016 article, 11 was the problem of overprescribing the result of a small 12 number of especially big prescribers? 13 A. The point of that 2016 article was to highlight 14 that the paradigm shift in treatment of pain in medicine 15 over the last three decades has led to all different 16 types of prescribers prescribing more opioids. 17 Q. And then -- 18 A. None -- nonetheless -- nonetheless, pill mill 19 doctors, or small subsets of prolific prescribers, have 20 also contributed to the problem. They're not the only 21 explanation, but they are a part of the problem. 22 So it's both pill mill doctors and the broad 23 shift in prescribing that has led to the oversupply of 24 opioids in our communities. 25 Q. And that shift in prescribing, was that because</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 It would involve an additional degree of 2 scrutiny and vigilance and also caution such that if 3 there is a spike or an increase in a specific region in 4 terms of orders for opioid medication, then the opioid 5 pharmaceutical industry has a responsibility to have a 6 very high suspicion for a problem in that community along 7 the lines of addiction, either through a legitimate 8 prescription or addiction through diversion. 9 Q. How is a distributor supposed to know if a 10 community is experiencing addiction through legitimate 11 prescriptions? 12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 13 THE WITNESS: The job of a distributor is to 14 assess suspicious orders. Suspicious orders are 15 determined in part by the volume of pills shipped to a 16 given region, a concern for pill mill doctors in that 17 region, a concern for diversion in that region. 18 So geographic spikes or increases in opioid 19 orders should be a concern for that community being 20 harmed by those opioids. 21 It's not enough to say that, well, that's what 22 the doctor ordered. That's not sufficient. That reneges 23 on their responsibility. 24 Sorry, I said "reneges on their responsibility," 25 not "renders."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 there was a wholesale shift in the generally accepted 2 medical practice as it relates to the treatment of pain? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. You also submitted a report in the Federal 5 multidistrict opioid litigation; is that correct? 6 A. Yes, that's correct. 7 Q. Is it fair to say that if you said something in 8 your earlier report but do not include it in your New 9 York report, then you do not intend to offer the earlier 10 opinion in this litigation? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase the question? 13 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Sure. 14 So the opinion or the report that you submitted 15 in the New York litigation is not exactly the same as the 16 report that you offered in the Federal litigation; is 17 that right? 18 A. That's right. 19 Q. And so my question is: If there are 20 differences, and you said something in the New York 21 report -- or excuse me. Strike that. 22 If there are differences and you said something 23 in the Federal report and that is not included in your 24 New York report, can we assume that you do not intend to 25 offer the information -- the opinion that was only in the</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 Federal litigation report?</p> <p>2 A. I would not assume that. I have a very large</p> <p>3 body of work that predates my involvement in any opioid</p> <p>4 litigation, and my opinions are based on that body of</p> <p>5 work, on my clinical experience, as well as my reports.</p> <p>6 It's -- it's all of a piece.</p> <p>7 Q. What opinions in your Federal report that are</p> <p>8 not in your New York report do you intend to offer in</p> <p>9 this case?</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: If you could refer to some</p> <p>12 specific difference between the reports, it would be</p> <p>13 easier for me to comment.</p> <p>14 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: So sitting here today, you can't</p> <p>15 identify opinions that were in your Federal report that</p> <p>16 are not in your New York report that you intend to offer</p> <p>17 in the New York litigation; is that correct?</p> <p>18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: The differences in the two reports</p> <p>20 are largely structural. The opinions are the same.</p> <p>21 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: You also gave a deposition in</p> <p>22 the Federal litigation?</p> <p>23 A. That's right.</p> <p>24 Q. And you were under oath?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I was.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 opioids currently for the treatment of chronic pain.</p> <p>2 Q. When you say that you only prescribe -- you</p> <p>3 prescribe opioids now only to treat opioid addiction; is</p> <p>4 that right?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. Is the reason you qualify it because that's a</p> <p>7 change from your past practices with respect to</p> <p>8 prescribing opioids?</p> <p>9 A. My opioid prescribing for pain occurred mainly</p> <p>10 when I was a medical intern and not in my psychiatric</p> <p>11 practice. It's not within the scope of psychiatric</p> <p>12 practice typically to prescribe Schedule II opioids for</p> <p>13 pain.</p> <p>14 The kind of treatment that I as a psychiatrist</p> <p>15 administer for pain has to do with psychological and</p> <p>16 mind-body interventions. I can certainly make</p> <p>17 recommendations, and I am actively involved in helping</p> <p>18 patients who have become dependent on or addicted to</p> <p>19 opioids, but I do that in collaboration with their opioid</p> <p>20 prescriber.</p> <p>21 That is a big part of my practice now, and my</p> <p>22 medical expertise is counseling primary care doctors and</p> <p>23 pain specialists, for example, on how to safely and</p> <p>24 compassionately taper their patients down to a lower dose</p> <p>25 of a Schedule II opioid or off of an opioid.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 Q. Did you have a chance to review the transcript</p> <p>2 after the deposition ended?</p> <p>3 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you have a chance to make changes to your</p> <p>5 testimony on an errata?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>7 Q. Is there any statement in the Federal litigation</p> <p>8 deposition that you now believe to be false?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. So you stand by what you said in that sworn</p> <p>11 testimony?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you treat patients with chronic pain?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you prescribe opioids to your patients?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Have you prescribed opioids to your patients</p> <p>18 with chronic pain?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. How long have you been prescribing opioids?</p> <p>21 A. I've been prescribing opioids since I began my</p> <p>22 medical training and my medical career in the mid-1990s.</p> <p>23 I would qualify my positive response to say that the only</p> <p>24 opioid that I prescribe now are opioids to treat opioid</p> <p>25 addiction. I treat chronic pain, but I don't prescribe</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 Q. When did you stop prescribing opioids for</p> <p>2 chronic pain?</p> <p>3 A. In the early aughts, when I transitioned to a</p> <p>4 primary psychiatric practice.</p> <p>5 Q. When is the last time you prescribed an opioid</p> <p>6 for pain?</p> <p>7 A. I can't give you a specific date.</p> <p>8 Q. Last year?</p> <p>9 A. No, I have not prescribed opioids for chronic</p> <p>10 pain for the last 15 to 20 years of my practice.</p> <p>11 Q. When did you last recommend that a doctor</p> <p>12 prescribe an opioid for a patient?</p> <p>13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I have lots of conversations with</p> <p>15 other healthcare providers around opioids and opioid</p> <p>16 prescribing. Those are careful and nuanced conversations</p> <p>17 that are based on the evidence, that are based on my</p> <p>18 clinical experience, and on the unique situation of that</p> <p>19 patient.</p> <p>20 Sometimes that involves recommending continuing</p> <p>21 an opioid for chronic pain at a given dose. Sometimes it</p> <p>22 involves recommending tapering to a lower dose or</p> <p>23 tapering off. It really depends on a specific patient</p> <p>24 situation.</p> <p>25 Although I will add that much of my work has to</p>

12 (Pages 42 - 45)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 do with helping healthcare providers safely and 2 compassionately taper their patients down to safer doses 3 or off entirely because of the harm done by taking 4 opioids chronologically and because of the lack of 5 evidence that opioids work for chronic pain and can even 6 make pain worse through a process called opioid-induced 7 hyperalgesia. 8 MR. MOONEY: Move to strike that answer. 9 Q. Dr. Lembke, my question was when did you last 10 recommend that a doctor prescribe an opioid for a 11 patient? 12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 13 THE WITNESS: That is a very general question. 14 So if you could be more specific about what opioid and 15 what kind of clinical scenario, I would be better able to 16 answer your question. 17 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Sitting here today, you can't 18 tell me when you last recommended that a doctor prescribe 19 an opioid for one of your patients under any 20 circumstances? 21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 22 THE WITNESS: No, that's not true. That's work 23 that I do in every clinic, and I see patients every week 24 in clinic. So the discussion around opioids, when to 25 prescribe, how much, whether to taper, how to taper,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 A. That's right. 2 Q. You said you have had conversations with other 3 doctors on -- and provide recommendations as to whether 4 their patients should continue to be treated with 5 opioids? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. When was the last time you made a recommendation 8 that a doctor continue to prescribe patients opioids? 9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 10 THE WITNESS: Tuesday. 11 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: So two days ago? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. What pharmacy were the pills that you prescribed 14 filled at? 15 A. I have these conversations around opioid 16 prescribing and doing a risk-benefit assessment and 17 whether the patient's developed opioid dependence or 18 opioid addiction so often in my clinical practice and on 19 such a regular basis that I could not tell you. It's not 20 an isolated event in my work. So, therefore, a specific 21 pharmacy doesn't stand out to me. 22 I can -- if it's helpful, I could list some of 23 the common pharmacies in my area, but I'm not sure. 24 Q. Which distributors fill the prescriptions that 25 you write?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 opioids and opioids in the use of chronic pain, opioids 2 in the use of acute pain, opioids in the use of opioid 3 use disorder is a conversation I have on a regular basis 4 in my professional work. 5 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: So is it fair to say on a 6 regular basis, you make recommendations that doctors 7 continue to prescribe opioids for your patients? 8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 9 THE WITNESS: As I said, I regularly have 10 discussions about whether opioids are indicated, how to 11 do a risk-benefit assessment, and what to do with the 12 opioid prescription. 13 The -- your question implies -- I guess I would 14 just, again, like clarification on your question because 15 I want to make sure that I answer it accurately. 16 Q. You said that in your -- in your work as an 17 addiction doctor -- 18 A. And -- 19 Q. As a psychiatrist. 20 A. And somebody who treats chronic pain and has a 21 courtesy appointment in the Department of Pain and 22 Anesthesia at Stanford School of Medicine. 23 Q. Right. You said that in the last 15 years, you 24 personally haven't prescribed opioids for chronic pain; 25 is that right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 A. I don't know. 2 Q. If one of your patients told you that a pharmacy 3 couldn't fill a prescription for opioids because the 4 distributor wouldn't ship to that pharmacy, what would 5 you tell your patient to do? 6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 7 THE WITNESS: It would really depend on the 8 specifics of that patient's circumstance. 9 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: If -- so what -- what would -- 10 what would depend on the patient's circumstances? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: The specific patient and where 13 they got their prescription and what it was for and 14 whether or not it was truly indicated and whether or not 15 their report was, in fact, accurate regarding whether or 16 not they were able to obtain that prescription for that 17 opioid. 18 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: And so if one of your patients 19 said that they couldn't fill a prescription for opioids 20 because the distributor wouldn't ship to that pharmacy, 21 and you went through all the circumstances of the patient 22 and you determined that this -- this patient needed 23 those -- those opioids, what would you tell the patient 24 to do? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Probably the first thing that I</p> <p>2 would do would be to contact the pharmacy directly and</p> <p>3 try to figure out what the circumstances were of their</p> <p>4 not having that particular medication.</p> <p>5 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Have you ever contacted a</p> <p>6 pharmacy to ask why they don't have a particular</p> <p>7 medication that you prescribe?</p> <p>8 A. Frequently.</p> <p>9 Q. And what did they -- what -- what answers have</p> <p>10 you received from pharmacies when you've made such calls?</p> <p>11 A. Sometimes it has to do with a prior</p> <p>12 authorization. Sometimes it has to do with the fact that</p> <p>13 they don't have it in stock. Sometimes it has to do with</p> <p>14 the fact that it's at another pharmacy in their same</p> <p>15 chain and they have to have it shipped over and that will</p> <p>16 take a few days.</p> <p>17 Sometimes it has to do with the fact that</p> <p>18 they're concerned about a pattern of behavior that</p> <p>19 they've seen in that particular patient, which makes them</p> <p>20 reluctant to dispense.</p> <p>21 Q. Have you ever consulted with a distributor about</p> <p>22 any of the prescriptions that you've written in your</p> <p>23 practice?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Will you tell me the last pain patient you wrote</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Opioids that I have prescribed</p> <p>2 have been diverted, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: And the opioids that you have</p> <p>4 prescribed that were diverted, how were they diverted?</p> <p>5 A. They were diverted by patients to whom I gave a</p> <p>6 prescription who then either sold or gave away the</p> <p>7 medications that I prescribed to them.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you report the diverted pills to the police?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you believe -- or excuse me, did you report</p> <p>11 the person who diverted the pills to the police?</p> <p>12 A. Most of my patients suffer from addiction, and</p> <p>13 so their behavior is part of their disease of addiction,</p> <p>14 and I don't see myself in a law enforcement role. My</p> <p>15 primary obligation to my patients is to care for them</p> <p>16 while also recognizing that I have a responsibility to</p> <p>17 the public.</p> <p>18 So when that happens, I change my prescribing to</p> <p>19 make sure that they don't have access to pills in the way</p> <p>20 that they had access before.</p> <p>21 Q. So diversion is not a crime when it's one of</p> <p>22 your patients; is that right?</p> <p>23 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. Argumentative.</p> <p>24 Don't answer that question.</p> <p>25 Come up with a new one.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 a prescription for?</p> <p>2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>3 She's not going to give you specifics of her</p> <p>4 patients. That's an invasion of confidentiality.</p> <p>5 Don't answer it.</p> <p>6 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Will you accept your counsel's</p> <p>7 advice?</p> <p>8 A. That would be a violation of HIPAA for me to</p> <p>9 refer to a specific patient. I would never do that.</p> <p>10 Q. What if I told you that I represent a</p> <p>11 distributor and I want to investigate your patients and</p> <p>12 how they're using opioids; would you then give me the</p> <p>13 name and medical records of your patient?</p> <p>14 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I would consult Stanford's legal</p> <p>16 and determine whether or not I was in a position to have</p> <p>17 to offer that, legally offer that information. I'm not a</p> <p>18 lawyer so I would consult a lawyer. And I would have</p> <p>19 first and foremost in my mind the care and</p> <p>20 confidentiality of my patient, which is my primary</p> <p>21 responsibility.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: From the opioids that you've</p> <p>23 prescribed, have any been diverted?</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. Assumes facts</p> <p>25 not in evidence.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Are you going to listen to your</p> <p>2 counsel and not answer?</p> <p>3 A. I feel like I've answered that question.</p> <p>4 Q. The question is pending. Can you answer the</p> <p>5 question or do you follow your counsel's advice not to</p> <p>6 answer it?</p> <p>7 A. I'm going to follow my counsel's advice not to</p> <p>8 answer.</p> <p>9 Q. Should doctors who know that medications they've</p> <p>10 prescribed have been diverted lose their license?</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: It really depends on the specific</p> <p>13 circumstance.</p> <p>14 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Do you agree that for a couple</p> <p>15 of days to a couple of weeks, opioids are magical for the</p> <p>16 treatment of pain?</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I would use the term</p> <p>19 "magical." Opioids can have benefit short-term. They</p> <p>20 are a useful tool. I would never suggest that there's no</p> <p>21 role for opioids in medical treatment, but every case is</p> <p>22 unique. Opioids are very high risk, and even when</p> <p>23 prescribed short-term, it's necessary to weigh the risks</p> <p>24 against the benefits.</p> <p>25 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: In your professional medical</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 experience, if a doctor prescribes prescription opioids 2 for short-term therapy of three weeks, how many opioid 3 pills does the doctor prescribe? 4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 5 THE WITNESS: It all depends on the specific 6 circumstance on what the medical indication is. 7 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Can you provide a range of the 8 number of pills that would be prescribed in a three-week 9 prescription? 10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 11 THE WITNESS: I really wouldn't want to 12 prescribe a range of pills. I don't think that's useful. 13 I wouldn't -- every case is unique. There is such a 14 range of medical conditions, of patient circumstances. 15 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Has the number of pills in a 16 prescription for three weeks of opioids remained the same 17 over the past decade? 18 A. There is huge variation opioid prescribing 19 across the country. In some geographic regions, opioid 20 prescribing has decreased rapidly; in others, it has not. 21 It really depends on which doctor. 22 Q. So it depends on the doctors, then? 23 A. It continues to depend largely on the doctor, 24 yeah. 25 Q. Have you ever been to Suffolk County, New York?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 A. Yes, I will. 2 Q. Last year, what percentage of your total 3 compensation came from serving as an expert in opioid 4 litigation in the United States? 5 A. I don't know. I haven't made that calculation. 6 Q. Have any of the plaintiffs in an opioid 7 litigation allowed you to fly on their private plane to 8 attend any hearing? 9 A. No. 10 Q. You said you've been paid approximately \$20,000 11 so far for the New York litigation; is that right? 12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 13 THE WITNESS: Again, I haven't added it up so I 14 don't know. 15 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: How many hours have you spent 16 working on the New York litigation? 17 A. I haven't added it up. I don't know. 18 Q. We were talking a little bit earlier about a 19 efficient supply chain. Strike that. 20 Can you approximate how long you've spent 21 working on the New York litigation? 22 A. I'm reluctant to approximate because I really 23 don't know. I would really -- I have a record. I could 24 add it up, but I -- I don't want to approximate and then 25 be far afield from what it actually was.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 A. I have not. 2 Q. Have you ever practiced medicine in Suffolk 3 County? 4 A. No. 5 Q. Have you ever been to Nassau County, New York? 6 A. No. 7 Q. Have you ever practiced -- have you ever been 8 licensed to practice medicine in the State of New York? 9 A. No. 10 MR. MOONEY: We've been going about an hour. Do 11 you want to take a break? 12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Sure. 13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the 14 time is 9:03 a.m. 15 (Recess.) 16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record. The time 17 is 9:26 a.m. 18 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Dr. Lembke, all in, how much 19 have you been paid by plaintiffs in any opioid litigation 20 in this country? 21 MR. ARBITBLIT: I'll object and instruct not to 22 answer unless we get an agreement that this is 23 reciprocal. 24 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Will you follow your counsel's 25 instruction?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 Q. So sitting here today, you can't provide an 2 approximation of how much time you've spent; correct? 3 A. I can easily provide the exact number if you'd 4 like me to access those records. I kept very careful 5 documentation of the time that I spent. 6 Q. Did you bring that time with you today? 7 A. I did not. 8 Q. So sitting here today, you cannot approximate 9 how much time you've spent on the New York litigation? 10 A. That's correct. 11 Q. We talked about an efficient supply chain 12 earlier. Do you recall that conversation? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Is Amazon an efficient distribution supply 15 chain? 16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 17 THE WITNESS: I'd like to know how that question 18 is relevant. 19 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: That's not -- that's not a 20 question that you get to ask. I asked a question. Do 21 you have an answer? 22 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 23 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Do you consider Amazon to be an 24 efficient distribution supply chain? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>

15 (Pages 54 - 57)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: It does seem efficient.</p> <p>2 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Can you identify any public</p> <p>3 statement that you made before April 2015 in which you</p> <p>4 claimed prescription opioids were overprescribed?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. When did you make that statement?</p> <p>7 A. I published a New England Journal of Medicine</p> <p>8 perspective on the opioid crisis.</p> <p>9 Q. And when did you publish that perspective?</p> <p>10 A. That was in 2012.</p> <p>11 Q. And in that perspective, you said that</p> <p>12 prescription opioids were overprescribed?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>14 Q. Can you identify any earlier statements than the</p> <p>15 2012 Journal of -- New England Journal of Medicine</p> <p>16 perspective?</p> <p>17 A. Prior to 2015, I was actively writing my book</p> <p>18 Drug Dealer M.D., How Doctors Were Duped, Patients Got</p> <p>19 Hooked, and Why It's So Hard to Stop, and I was also</p> <p>20 teaching on the topic of the opioid problem and giving</p> <p>21 lectures. So I was frequently making statements</p> <p>22 regarding the oversupply and overprescribing of opioids.</p> <p>23 Q. Can you identify any statements earlier than</p> <p>24 2012 in which you said that prescription opioids were</p> <p>25 overprescribed?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 So, you know, I've been working and studying</p> <p>2 this problem since the early aughts so it's probable that</p> <p>3 I made statements to the overprescribing of opioids prior</p> <p>4 to 2012. But 2012 was a kind of a landmark paper that I</p> <p>5 published in the New England Journal of Medicine on this</p> <p>6 topic followed by many publications since then regarding</p> <p>7 the overprescribing and the oversupply of opioids.</p> <p>8 Q. You reference on page 13 of your report in</p> <p>9 romanette II a 1954 study. And you quote the study as</p> <p>10 saying: "Morphine is not the answer to chronic pain."</p> <p>11 Do you recall that study?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>13 Q. Can you identify any article that you wrote</p> <p>14 between 1996 and the present in which you cited that 1954</p> <p>15 study?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. In your report you write about a 2001 continuing</p> <p>18 medication -- or continuing medical education course on</p> <p>19 the treatment of pain that every licensed physician in</p> <p>20 California was required to attend.</p> <p>21 Do you recall that continuing medical education</p> <p>22 course?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>24 Q. So first off, what is a continuing medical</p> <p>25 education course?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 A. Do you mean written statements, published</p> <p>2 statements, or just statements in general?</p> <p>3 Q. Let's start with published statements and then</p> <p>4 we can turn to written statements or journal articles,</p> <p>5 rather than any talks or lectures. Not for your</p> <p>6 students, but public facing.</p> <p>7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Let me take a look at my CV which</p> <p>9 is in my report.</p> <p>10 It's possible that I referred to the oversupply</p> <p>11 of opioids in the chapter that I wrote for the Stanford</p> <p>12 School of Medicine Handbook of Developmental Psychiatry</p> <p>13 On Adolescents and Young Adult Substance Use Problems.</p> <p>14 I'd have to refer to that document to verify that.</p> <p>15 Q. My question was about overprescribing, not</p> <p>16 oversupply.</p> <p>17 A. It's possible that I referred to it in that</p> <p>18 document. I'd have to go back and reference that.</p> <p>19 It's possible that I made a reference to</p> <p>20 overprescribing of opioids in a publication for addiction</p> <p>21 in 2013, From Self-Medication to Intoxication, Time For a</p> <p>22 Paradigm Shift.</p> <p>23 As I said, in 2012 in the New England Journal of</p> <p>24 Medicine piece, Why Doctors Prescribe Opioids to Known</p> <p>25 Opioid Abusers.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 A. Continuing medical education is courses that are</p> <p>2 required for physicians to take after they finish medical</p> <p>3 school and after they finish residency, once they're in</p> <p>4 practice, in order to ensure that they have the latest</p> <p>5 evidence to inform their care of patients. Attending a</p> <p>6 certain number of continuing medical education courses</p> <p>7 per year is mandatory in order to maintain licensure.</p> <p>8 Q. And continuing medical education courses, are</p> <p>9 they sometimes called CMEs?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, they are.</p> <p>11 Q. Did you attend the 2001 CME on the treatment of</p> <p>12 pain that every licensed physician in California was</p> <p>13 required to attend?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>15 Q. Where was that CME held?</p> <p>16 A. That was held in Palo Alto, California.</p> <p>17 Q. And how many people attended that event?</p> <p>18 A. I don't know the exact number. It looks to be</p> <p>19 in the thousands.</p> <p>20 Q. And who presented at that 2001 CME?</p> <p>21 A. I don't recall specific presenters except for</p> <p>22 some of my Stanford colleagues who presented at that CME.</p> <p>23 Q. Were there any representatives from a</p> <p>24 pharmaceutical distributor that presented at the 2001</p> <p>25 CME?</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 A. There probably were, but I don't recall any 2 specifics. 3 Q. Why do you say there probably were? 4 A. Because it is very common for the pharmaceutical 5 industry to financially support CME and also to have 6 booths or tables at these events to promote their 7 products. That's been the standard, unfortunately. 8 Q. My question was different. Were there any 9 representatives of a pharmaceutical distributor, not the 10 pharmaceutical industry, the pharmaceutical distributor, 11 that presented at the 2001 CME? 12 A. Not that I recall. 13 Q. You write in your report, page 23, paragraph 14 romanette V: "I recall that there was no accurate 15 presentation of the risks of opioids, and the messages 16 that were provided tracks the misconceptions described 17 above regarding overstatement of the benefits of 18 opioids." 19 Did I read that correctly? 20 A. Yes, you did. 21 Q. At the time you attended the CME in 2001, did 22 you do anything to alert the attendees of the event that 23 the information that was being provided that day was 24 inaccurate? 25 A. I was extremely early in my career. I was very</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 year after 2001, did you do anything to alert doctors 2 that you believed the information that was provided at 3 the 2001 CME about prescription opioids was inaccurate? 4 A. Yes, I did. 5 Q. What did you do? 6 A. I began in my lectures to medical students and 7 residents and colleagues to talk about the problem of 8 opioids, the fact that they were being overprescribed, 9 that we, as a healthcare community, had been sold a bill 10 of goods regarding their safety and efficacy, and that we 11 had a responsibility to our patients to do something 12 about that problem. 13 I -- and I also, as you know, then published an 14 article in 2012 in The New England Journal of Medicine 15 which directly addressed this problem, and some of the 16 origins, though not all of the origins, specifically in 17 order to alert my colleagues in the healthcare profession 18 about the problem of opioid overprescribing and the 19 inherent risks associated with it. 20 And then I also began work on my book that was 21 ultimately published by Johns Hopkins University Press in 22 2016 that specifically addresses this opioid crisis. 23 My intention in writing the book was to educate 24 my colleagues and patient-consumers about this problem. 25 Q. Let's try this one more time.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 junior in my institution, and I did not alert anybody 2 because at that time, I myself was buying into those 3 misrepresentations. I was the convinced or let's say 4 partially convinced recipient of those misleading 5 messages. 6 Q. Any time in the year after the 2001 CME, did you 7 do anything to alert doctors that you believed the 8 information that was provided about prescription opioids 9 was inaccurate? 10 A. The evolution in my thinking occurred over that 11 decade, from approximately the year 2000 or, let's say, 12 the late -- mid-to-late '90s. I was trained in -- I went 13 to medical school, as you know, in the 1990s, my 14 residency in the late 1990s, and the evolution in my 15 thinking occurred over that decade since my medical 16 training. 17 So I did not alert anybody because I was 18 experiencing an evolution in my own thinking, and a 19 growing concern and skepticism regarding the messaging 20 that I had been the recipient of in medical school, in 21 residency, and at continuing medical education courses. 22 And as I read more in the literature and saw 23 patients, I began to realize that what I had been taught 24 was false. 25 Q. Coming back to the question. At any time in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 In the year after the 2001 CME, 2001 to 2002, 2 did you do anything to alert doctors that you believed 3 the information that was provided about prescription 4 opioids was inaccurate? 5 A. I probably did. Informally talking about with 6 colleagues, expressing my skepticism and concern, but 7 again, that was my beginning of my awareness of a problem 8 as I began seeing more and more patients who were 9 misusing, dependent on, and addicted to prescription 10 opioids. 11 So to answer your question, it wasn't something 12 that happened suddenly overnight. It was an evolution in 13 my thinking beginning in the late 1990s, early aughts. 14 So there's not a specific point, but as I became 15 concerned, yes, I regularly talked with colleagues. I 16 began to think about the problem and address the problem. 17 Q. Was the CME presented again in 2002 with similar 18 misinformation? 19 A. I don't know. 20 Q. What about in 2003? 21 A. I didn't track that exact CME and whether it was 22 presented, but I know that it was a requirement in 2001 23 to complete a CME on pain, which was a very unusual 24 circumstance. There were very few mandatory CMEs across 25 all specialties.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 And so it was significant to me, even at the 2 time that I took the 2001 CME, that I was being mandated 3 as a psychiatrist to take a course on pain. 4 What I learned, through my work and my research 5 over the ensuing decade, is that even that requirement 6 was probably the result of the opioid pharmaceutical 7 industry and their lobbying efforts to create this 8 paradigm shift in the treatment of pain and to 9 disseminate their misleading messages to every kind of 10 medical specialist. 11 Q. Who required -- where did the -- where did the 12 requirement come from that doctors had to attend this 13 2001 CME? 14 A. It came from the California State Medical Board. 15 Q. Exhibit B to your report lists the materials you 16 considered in reaching your opinions in this litigation; 17 is that right? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And you tried to make sure that that list was 20 complete? 21 A. Yes, I did. 22 Q. It was missing a few documents; right? 23 A. Which documents are you referring to? 24 Q. Well, last night your counsel provided us with a 25 supplemental list of materials you considered.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 clinical experience -- if there are materials that you 2 considered in forming the opinions that are in your 3 report, you listed them in Exhibit B or in the 4 supplemental materials considered list; is that correct? 5 A. To the best of my knowledge, that is correct. 6 Q. Did you consider any documents that were 7 produced by a distributor in this case? 8 A. I don't believe so. Except for the McKesson 9 Nucynta coupons, which I believe were created by 10 McKesson. Or at least by McKesson in collaboration with 11 Janssen. 12 Q. When you use the term "pharmaceutical opioid 13 industry" in your report, are you using it to mean the 14 same thing you meant in the Federal litigation report? 15 A. I'm using it to mean opioid manufacturers, 16 distributors and pharmacies. 17 Q. And so are you meaning -- are you using it to 18 mean the same thing that you meant in your Federal 19 litigation report? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. On page 6 of your report, at Opinion 3 you 22 write: "The pharmaceutical opioid industry contributed 23 to the paradigm shift in opioid prescribing through 24 promotional materials and its use and manipulation of key 25 opinion leaders, continuing medical education courses,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 Are you aware of that? 2 A. Yes. 3 MR. MOONEY: Okay. Handing you Exhibit 3 to 4 your report. 5 (Exhibit 3, Supplemental Materials Considered 6 List, Dr. Anna Lembke, marked for 7 identification.) 8 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Which is the list of 9 supplemental materials considered that we received from 10 counsel last evening. 11 Have you identified any other documents between 12 last night and this morning that should be on a list 13 of -- or a list of materials you considered in forming 14 your opinion? 15 A. No. 16 Q. And so if you considered a document in forming 17 your opinions that you offer in this case, you listed the 18 document on Exhibit B or the supplemental list that was 19 provided last night; correct? 20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 21 THE WITNESS: My opinion has been informed by 22 the documents that I've reviewed as well as 20 years of 23 clinical experience and training. 24 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Right. If there are materials, 25 though -- setting aside your clinical training and your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 professional medical societies, a Federation of State 2 Medical Boards to the Joint Commission to convey 3 misleading messages about the safety and efficacy of 4 prescription opioids." 5 Did I read that correctly? 6 A. Yes, you did. 7 Q. What is a "key opinion leader"? 8 A. A key opinion leader is an individual with 9 influence in the medical community, often an academic of 10 prestigious standing, for example, a professor or a 11 clinic chief at a major university or medical center who 12 is then working as a paid consultant for a pharmaceutical 13 company to promote their messaging. 14 Q. Can you identify any payments to a key opinion 15 leader by CardinalHealth? 16 A. No. 17 Q. How about for McKesson? 18 A. No. 19 Q. Same question for AmerisourceBergen Drug 20 Corporation and Rochester Drug Co-op. 21 A. No. 22 Q. When you say "the pharmaceutical opioid industry 23 used and manipulated key opinion leaders," are you 24 talking about distributors? 25 A. I'm talking about opioid manufacturers.</p>

18 (Pages 66 - 69)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 Q. When you say "the pharmaceutical opioid industry 2 used and manipulated continuing medical education 3 courses," are you talking about distributors? 4 A. No. 5 Q. When you say "the pharmaceutical opioid industry 6 used and manipulated professional medical societies," are 7 you talking about distributors? 8 A. No. 9 Q. When you say "the pharmaceutical opioid industry 10 used and manipulated the Federation of State Medical 11 Boards and the Joint Commission," are you talking about 12 distributors? 13 A. No. 14 Q. Can you identify any false or misleading claim 15 about opioids that was made by a pharmaceutical 16 distributor that has been named as a defendant in this 17 case? 18 A. No. 19 Q. Of the oxycodone and hydrocodone pills dispensed 20 in the United States, what percentage were prescribed by 21 a doctor and filled by a patient? 22 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 23 THE WITNESS: I refer to my report, page 12, the 24 NASEM report, based on DEA reports noting 76 billion 25 oxycodone and hydrocodone pills delivered in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 appreciate the complexity of the problem. Patients who 2 receive a prescription for a legitimate medical purpose 3 can go on themselves to be addicted to that opioid. They 4 can also divert a portion of their legitimate 5 prescription to others who are then harmed. 6 That diversion may occur intentionally or 7 unintentionally, for example, a teenager getting pills 8 from a grandparent's medicine cabinet without the 9 awareness of that individual who has the legitimate 10 prescription. 11 Then there are individuals who intentionally 12 seek out a doctor for the purpose of obtaining pills for 13 non-legitimate medical purposes. 14 So it's very difficult to answer that question 15 simply. It's a complicated question. It's a complicated 16 situation, and I don't think we even now fully know 17 accurately of the rates of diversion. We have estimates, 18 but... 19 Q. I understand that diversion can occur after the 20 prescription is filled and it can occur in other places, 21 too. 22 My question is: What percentage of doctors' 23 prescription of opioids are not for legitimate medical 24 purposes? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 United States, with 12 to 19 billion pills diverted. 2 Diversion can occur at multiple levels prior to a doctor 3 prescribing it or a pharmacy receiving it, at the time of 4 prescription and also after the prescription. So it's 5 extremely hard to estimate. 6 MR. MOONEY: Move to strike. 7 Q. But what percentage of -- of the oxycodone and 8 hydrocodone pills dispensed in the United States, what 9 percentage were prescribed by a doctor and filled by a 10 patient? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: The majority, but I don't know the 13 exact percent. 14 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: And of the percentage of opioids 15 that are prescribed by a doctor and filled by a patient, 16 what percentage of those pills were pursuant to illegal 17 prescriptions? 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 19 THE WITNESS: Very hard to quantify that. It 20 would really depend on what you mean by an illegal 21 prescription. 22 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: What percentage of doctors' 23 prescriptions for opioids are not for legitimate medical 24 purposes? 25 A. Again, I think that the question doesn't really</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: How would you define "legitimate 2 medical purposes"? 3 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: As a doctor, do you have 4 responsibilities to ensure that your patients -- or that 5 you prescribe medications for patients that are for 6 legitimate medical purposes? 7 A. Yes, we do. But if we've been misinformed about 8 what a legitimate medical purpose is, then we may 9 prescribe believing that we're engaging in a legitimate 10 prescription, when in fact, that prescription may not be 11 what is helpful to that patient. 12 Q. What percentage of doctors' prescriptions for 13 prescription opioids are for a legitimate medical 14 purpose, assuming that it is done with the belief that 15 they are engaging in appropriate medical care? 16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 17 THE WITNESS: The majority of opioid 18 prescriptions are for a legitimate medical purpose, but I 19 couldn't quantify it. I just believe that the majority 20 of doctors are well-intended and trying to help their 21 patients. 22 There are doctors who have lost their moral 23 compass and are prescribing opioids knowing that their 24 patient shouldn't get those opioids, and that subset is a 25 part of this problem, but another large part of this</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 problem is well-intended doctors who believe they are 2 prescribing opioids for legitimate purposes but have been 3 misinformed and miseducated due to defendants' actions. 4 Q. What percentage of opioid medication prescribed 5 by a doctor and dispensed by a pharmacy sits unused in a 6 patient's medicine cabinet? 7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: There are data coming out now 9 showing that a large percentage of opioids that are 10 prescribed by a doctor are not, in fact, used by the 11 patient, especially in the postoperative setting. These 12 are data that are now being used to inform how opioids 13 should be prescribed postoperatively. 14 What the studies are showing -- and I do cite 15 them in my report, and I can go to that place, if you'd 16 like -- are that as healthcare providers are cutting back 17 on opioid prescriptions, they're finding that their 18 patients are reporting no increases in pain, no increases 19 in calls for refills, and that they have fewer opioids 20 left sitting around in medicine cabinets for teenagers or 21 neighbors or whoever it is to come and take those 22 opioids. So -- 23 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Do you -- sorry. Go ahead. 24 A. So my point being that with the growing 25 awareness of the opioid epidemic and research that is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 getting opioid pills from their friends at school, 2 leftover prescriptions or from somebody at school who had 3 pills who sold or gave it to them. 4 So what I saw over the first several decades of 5 this century was a growing number of patients who were 6 telling me that opioids were everywhere, that they were 7 easy to get, that you could ask a friend or you could 8 find a dealer, you know, one text message away, or you 9 could go see a doctor and easily obtain them. 10 Again, some of these were individuals who were 11 intentionally seeking out opioids for recreational use 12 and other of them were pain patients who themselves were 13 becoming addicted through their legitimate prescription. 14 I've also spent much of the last five years 15 traveling around the country, all over the country, 16 talking to doctors, trying to educate them about this 17 problem, urging them to prescribe opioids more 18 judiciously. And in that process, I've had many 19 conversations with doctors who have expressed that they 20 were duped by the pharmaceutical industry, that they 21 engaged in a very liberal prescription pad in terms of 22 prescribing opioids, and that they were looking back on 23 that practice with regret. 24 Interestingly, I was in Buffalo last year to 25 give a conference, to give a talk on the opioid epidemic</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 studying the extent of the harm, we are finding out that 2 a lot of patients are using some of their prescription 3 and leaving the rest to either be stolen, or in some 4 cases, they themselves may be diverting part of their 5 prescription or selling part of their prescription. 6 Q. And when did that growing awareness begin? 7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: That growing awareness on my part? 9 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Sorry. Go ahead. 10 A. That began for me in the early 2000s, as I 11 started seeing more and more patients coming into my 12 office reporting that they were misusing or addicted to 13 opioids. When I asked them where they got those opioids, 14 many of them reported that they got the opioids from a 15 doctor. 16 Many of them actually believed that they were 17 taking the opioids in part for a legitimate pain 18 condition but also expressed concern that they were 19 becoming addicted through that legitimate prescription. 20 I also began seeing more and more patients in 21 the early aughts and beyond reporting that they had 22 increased easy access to prescription opioids from 23 friends and family members, left over opioids in medicine 24 cabinets. 25 I had teenagers coming in saying they were</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 to doctors, and one of the doctors came up to me 2 afterward and said that in her clinic, which was a clinic 3 for gynecologic cancer -- she had been in practice more 4 than 15 years -- they had instituted a new policy of 5 getting urine drug screens in their long-time opioid 6 chronic pain patients. 7 And to her shock and dismay, they discovered 8 that a large percentage of those patients had a urine 9 drug screen that was negative for opioids, the 10 implication being that individuals to whom they had been 11 giving what they thought were legitimate prescriptions 12 for many years, that those individuals were not, in fact, 13 taking the opioids that they were prescribing. 14 So through these many types of conversations, my 15 own clinical experience, and my reading in the 16 literature, I have seen what I have called in my report 17 the tsunami effect, the rising tide, the increased 18 supply. 19 And as an addiction medicine specialist, I know 20 that one of the biggest risk factors for developing 21 addiction is access to the drug. If you live in a 22 neighborhood where drugs are sold on the street corner, 23 you're more likely to try that drug and you're more 24 likely to get addicted to that drug. 25 We've been living in a society for the past</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 30 years where opioids are readily available to anybody 2 who wants them. And as a direct result of that increased 3 supply and exposure, we now have an opioid epidemic of 4 addiction and death on our hands. 5 Q. Dr. Lembke, do you have Exhibit 1 in front of 6 you? 7 A. Exhibit 1. 8 Q. It might be under your report. The copy that I 9 used -- 10 A. This? 11 Q. No, the Court's order. 12 A. Yes, I do. 13 Q. Okay. Now, were you made aware of this Court 14 order before your deposition today? 15 A. Yes, I was. 16 Q. And so you know that Justice Garguilo entered an 17 order that said in paragraph 1: "Your role as an expert 18 is not one of advocacy. Your role is to listen to the 19 question and answer the question. You are not to comment 20 on anything beyond the information sought within the 21 question." 22 Did I read that correctly? 23 A. Yes, you did. 24 Q. Now, before you started answering my question -- 25 the question that was pending before your monologue:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 after "in the early 2000s." 2 Q. For the medical community at large, when did the 3 growing awareness of the opioid epidemic begin? 4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 5 THE WITNESS: In 2011, the CDC issued a warning 6 that we were in the midst of a prescription drug 7 epidemic, and they, in their warning, clearly stated that 8 the case was increased prescribing of opioids and other 9 psychotropic medication. 10 I think that that was a very important missive 11 and an important year that contributed to a growing 12 public awareness around the opioid epidemic. 13 Following that, there were increasing numbers of 14 reports in the media and in the lay press that I think 15 also helped the growing awareness, the public awareness. 16 I can say that approximately two years ago, for 17 the first time in my professional career, I started 18 seeing chronic pain patients coming in asking for help to 19 get off of their opioids, that they had heard that 20 opioids were dangerous, that they had been on them for a 21 long time, and that they wanted to get off. 22 That, to me, was evidence of the slow shift and 23 a growing awareness, when patients themselves were coming 24 in saying, I read this article in the newspaper, or I 25 heard this on the radio that opioids are dangerous and I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 "When did that growing awareness begin?" That's a time 2 question, is it not? 3 A. (Nods head.) 4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 5 THE WITNESS: Because my growing awareness as 6 implied by the word "growing," growing is something that 7 happens gradually over time. Things don't grow in a 8 second or a day, I felt that in order to accurately 9 answer your question, I needed to explain the growth of 10 my awareness over the time period during which it 11 occurred. 12 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: The information sought within 13 the question, "When did it begin," you said, "It began 14 for me in the early 2000s." That's an answer to when; 15 correct? 16 A. It is a partial answer to when. If one's 17 growing awareness -- and those were your words, "growing 18 awareness," a growing awareness occurs over a longer 19 period of time, or at least my growing awareness occurred 20 over a longer period of time. And my response was my 21 best effort to thoroughly and accurately answer your 22 question. 23 MR. MOONEY: All right. We have a limited 24 amount of time with you so I'm not going to argue with 25 you on this any more, but I move to strike everything</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 didn't know that, and I'd like to get off. 2 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Do you have an opinion on the 3 steps distributors could take to prevent unused medicine 4 from doctors' prescriptions from sitting unused in 5 people's medicine cabinets? 6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 7 THE WITNESS: I think that anything the opioid 8 pharmaceutical industry can do to limit the supply of 9 opioids to just what is evidence-based use of those 10 opioids would help reduce the number of pills sitting in 11 people's medicine cabinets. 12 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: If distributors provided 13 20 percent less opioids across the board to all 14 pharmacies and hospitals, would that help with the 15 epidemic? 16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 17 THE WITNESS: I'm not in a position to opine on 18 exact percentages or numbers. There are other experts 19 who will be weighing in on the -- on the role of 20 distributors who possibly could answer that, but that's 21 not a question that -- that I'm in a position to answer. 22 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: How would a pharm- -- if 23 distributors provided 20 percent less medication across 24 the board to pharmacies and hospitals, how would those 25 pharmacies and hospitals decide which patients'</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 prescriptions to fill and which ones should not be 2 filled?</p> <p>3 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: The question is a hypothetical. I 5 am uncomfortable with a specific number of 20 percent. 6 But I would say that the bottom line is that pharmacies 7 and hospitals should fill prescriptions that are based on 8 evidence-based medicine, with careful scrutiny as to 9 whether or not the individual and the community is being 10 harmed by the way in which those prescriptions are being 11 filled. So everybody has responsibility.</p> <p>12 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Including doctors?</p> <p>13 A. Including doctors, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. What would you -- what would a pharmacist need 15 to know to determine which prescriptions to fill and 16 which ones should not be filled?</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Even now, pharmacists are checking 19 the prescription drug monitoring database to see if the 20 patient is engaged in so-called doctor shopping or 21 whether or not there's dangerous co-prescribing, such as 22 combining opioids and benzodiazepines or opioids and other 23 sedatives.</p> <p>24 A pharmacist should also have some familiarity 25 with that doctor and their general practice and whether</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 Nassau or Suffolk County?</p> <p>2 A. By shipping large numbers of pills very 3 efficiently so that pharmacies were heavily stocked with 4 these pills, Suffolk County, along with the rest of the 5 United States, was heavily impacted.</p> <p>6 Q. Right. My question, though, is: How did the 7 distribution campaign affect the rates at which doctors 8 prescribed opioids in Nassau and Suffolk County?</p> <p>9 A. I refer to this in my report. I'd like to go to 10 that spot.</p> <p>11 Okay. So between -- as I say on page 89 of my 12 report: "New York State data show a four-fold increase 13 in opioid mortality in the 25 to 44 age group from 2010 14 to 2016." And that includes Suffolk County.</p> <p>15 So that increase in addiction among young adults 16 is a result of the increased supply of opioids in that 17 community, and the increased supply is a result of 18 defendants' actions, including distributors and 19 pharmacies.</p> <p>20 MR. MOONEY: Move to strike.</p> <p>21 Q. Dr. Lembke, my question was: In what way did 22 the distribution campaigns impact the rates at which 23 doctors prescribe opioids in Nassau and Suffolk County?</p> <p>24 A. Let me give you a corollary example. I saw a 25 patient last week with alcohol abuse disorder, and I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 or not they are practicing in a responsible way.</p> <p>2 The pharmacist should also be aware of the CDC 3 guidelines that are recommending that opioids not be used 4 as first-line treatment for pain and that doses for acute 5 pain be limited.</p> <p>6 Pharmacists should also just have good old 7 common sense, and if they're observing somebody who is 8 clearly impaired or intoxicated, along the lines of 9 somebody who may be misusing or addicted to opioids, that 10 should also play into their decision making.</p> <p>11 For example, I have had pharmacists call me, and 12 even though I wrote a legitimate prescription for what I 13 believed was a legitimate medical indication, they have 14 called me and said, you know, I'm concerned about this 15 patient, she's presenting in a way that makes me think 16 she's intoxicated, and she's getting prescriptions, 17 multiple prescriptions from, you know, other providers. 18 Also, I have this history with this particular patient 19 prior to her being your patient, and so I know that she 20 has had X, Y or Z problem.</p> <p>21 These are all emergent, relevant, health-related 22 details that need to be communicated between everybody in 23 the opioid supply chain.</p> <p>24 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: In what way did prescription 25 opioid distribution campaigns impact prescribing rates in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 prescribed Antabuse disulfiram to him, and he was not 2 able to obtain that medication from several different 3 pharmacies in the area. I'm not sure why. So, 4 therefore, we thought about a different or alternative 5 medication.</p> <p>6 So if I'm practicing in a region where every 7 single opioid formulation under the sun is readily 8 available at every single pharmacy, and that becomes the 9 normative way to address pain, that is -- this is an 10 example of how distributors have impacted the rates at 11 which doctors describe opioids.</p> <p>12 Q. What percentage of prescriptions for opioids are 13 due to a doctor's decision to provide a different or 14 alternative medication because the medication that they 15 want to provide is not available?</p> <p>16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I guess I don't really understand 18 the question.</p> <p>19 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Well, I didn't understand your 20 answer before because I asked about Nassau and Suffolk 21 County.</p> <p>22 But what I understood you to mean was when you 23 thought about prescribing a different or alternative 24 medication that wasn't available, you thought about 25 providing something else; right?</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 A. (Nods head.)</p> <p>2 Q. And then you said: "If I am practicing in a</p> <p>3 region where every single opioid formulation under the</p> <p>4 sun is ready available" -- "readily available at every</p> <p>5 single pharmacy, and that becomes the normative way to</p> <p>6 address pain, that is an example of how distributors have</p> <p>7 impacted the rates at which doctors prescribe opioids."</p> <p>8 Is that the gist of what you said?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. So my question is: Taking your corollary</p> <p>11 example about an alcohol -- a patient suffering from</p> <p>12 alcoholism in California, what percentage of</p> <p>13 prescriptions are written for opioids in Nassau or</p> <p>14 Suffolk County because the doctor wasn't able to get the</p> <p>15 other drug that he or she wanted because it was</p> <p>16 unavailable at the pharmacy?</p> <p>17 A. I don't --</p> <p>18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>20 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Are you offering on opinion on</p> <p>21 the appropriate number of pills that should have been</p> <p>22 distributed in the State of New York?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. You've talked a couple of times about the NASEM</p> <p>25 report on page 12 of your report.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And the third one is diversion after the</p> <p>4 prescription has been filled, for example, by subsequent</p> <p>5 transfer or sale to a third party; is that right?</p> <p>6 A. Yes. Yes, that's right.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you agree that after a prescription for an</p> <p>8 opioid has been filled, a pharmaceutical distributor no</p> <p>9 longer has control over what happens to those dispensed</p> <p>10 drugs?</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I think that a distributor has</p> <p>13 responsibility regarding the diversion of an opioid pill</p> <p>14 after it's been filled.</p> <p>15 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: My question was different:</p> <p>16 After the pharmaceutical opioid has been dispensed --</p> <p>17 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>18 Q. -- do you agree that the distributor no longer</p> <p>19 has control over what happens to the drugs?</p> <p>20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by "control"?</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: After one of your patients fills</p> <p>23 a prescription for opioids, can CardinalHealth go to</p> <p>24 their house and take the unused medication out of their</p> <p>25 closet?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 A. (Nods head.)</p> <p>2 Q. And you referenced in romanette III that there</p> <p>3 are several ways that prescription drugs are diverted to</p> <p>4 non-medical use.</p> <p>5 Do you recall writing that in your report?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And the first example you give is diversion</p> <p>8 before a prescription has been filled, for example, theft</p> <p>9 from production facilities or retail pharmacies; is that</p> <p>10 right?</p> <p>11 A. That's right.</p> <p>12 Q. Are you offering any opinion about any theft</p> <p>13 from a distributor in this case?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. What percentage of diverted opioids are due to</p> <p>16 theft from a distributor?</p> <p>17 A. I don't know.</p> <p>18 Q. Can we agree that actual -- can we agree that</p> <p>19 actual theft is rare?</p> <p>20 A. I wouldn't agree to that because I have nothing</p> <p>21 to base that on.</p> <p>22 Q. The second version -- the second form of</p> <p>23 diversion in your report that you reference is diversion</p> <p>24 via filling a prescription, for example, pursuant to</p> <p>25 doctor shopping and high-frequency prescribers; is that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: No, but what CardinalHealth can do</p> <p>3 is note suspicious orders or regions in which there is a</p> <p>4 heavy volume of pills not justified by the need for</p> <p>5 analgesia in that community and investigate.</p> <p>6 MR. MOONEY: Move to strike everything after</p> <p>7 "no."</p> <p>8 Q. Do you have a basis to offer an expert opinion</p> <p>9 in this case that pharmaceutical distributors have the</p> <p>10 ability to control what happens to prescription opioids</p> <p>11 after they have been dispensed pursuant to a doctor's</p> <p>12 prescription?</p> <p>13 A. Again, I think I answered that. I think those</p> <p>14 things are tied. I think a distributor has a</p> <p>15 responsibility to track what happens to the prescription</p> <p>16 after it's been dispensed, and in the case of finding a</p> <p>17 suspicious or concerning situation, to intervene.</p> <p>18 Q. In your own medical practice, have you ever</p> <p>19 reported to a distributor which medications you've</p> <p>20 prescribed and to whom?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. Why not?</p> <p>23 A. That's just not something I've ever done.</p> <p>24 Q. Why not?</p> <p>25 A. For the most part, I track my patients and their</p>

23 (Pages 86 - 89)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 use of the opioids that I prescribe extremely closely, 2 such that if there is diversion of any sort, it's very 3 minimal. I catch it within the week because of the way 4 that I practice, and so I'm able to take care of that 5 situation. 6 And that is not, by the way, the standard of 7 care or it has not been the standard of care. We're 8 trying to change that. That's not the way that opioids 9 are commonly being prescribed and monitored. 10 Q. Of the three types of diversion that you list in 11 romanette III on page 12, only one diversion before the 12 prescription is filled can occur when a distributor is in 13 physical possession of the prescription opioids; is that 14 right? 15 A. Yes. 16 MR. MOONEY: Let's take like a 15-minute break 17 and I will... 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Thank you. 19 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the 21 time is 10:19 a.m. 22 (Recess.) 23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time 24 is 10:37 a.m. 25 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Dr. Lembke, before the break,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 of addiction and overdose death, and the specifics of the 2 distributors responsibility from a legal perspective is 3 something that other experts will opine on. 4 Q. So you don't have a proposal in your report as 5 to how a distributor is supposed to track individual 6 prescriptions after they've been dispensed; is that 7 correct? 8 A. That's correct. 9 Q. You said that you've never provided prescription 10 information to a distributor. Have any of your 11 colleagues at Stanford? 12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 13 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 14 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: You also said before the break 15 that you generally catch diversion within a week; is that 16 right? 17 A. That's right. 18 Q. How do you do that? 19 A. We have a very high level of scrutiny and 20 stewardship in our clinic, informed by my awareness of 21 this problem and my understanding of the disease of 22 addiction. So we dispense opioids on a weekly basis, and 23 patients come in every week, and we check the 24 prescription drug monitoring database in order to ensure 25 that they're not going to other prescribers to get the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 you testified that a distributor has a responsibility to 2 track what happens to the prescription after it's been 3 dispensed, and in the case of finding a suspicious or 4 concerning situation, to intervene. 5 Was that your testimony? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. How is a distributor supposed to track an 8 individual prescription? 9 A. There are other experts who will be testifying 10 on the legal responsibilities of distributors. That's 11 not my role here. But my opinion is that everybody in 12 the opioid supply chain has a responsibility, and the 13 unique responsibility of distributors is to scrutinize 14 and identify suspicious orders or an area of the country 15 or a pharmacy where it appears that the supply of opioids 16 is increasing beyond medical need. 17 Q. You also said, though, before the break that a 18 distributor has a responsibility to track what happens to 19 the prescription after it has been dispensed. My 20 question is: How do they do that? 21 A. I -- I can suggest ways that -- that they might 22 do that. I think that's maybe more appropriate for 23 abatement. 24 Again, the scope of my expert testimony is 25 really about the impact of increased supply on the rates</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 same or similar prescription or engaging in dangerous 2 co-prescribing that we weren't previously aware of. 3 We also get urine drug screens at every visit 4 early in our opioid prescribing relationship and then at 5 random intervals later, in order to ensure that the 6 patient is taking the opioid that we are prescribing to 7 them and is not taking other substances that are 8 prohibited through our patient-provider contract. 9 We have a patient-provider contract that we 10 discuss what is -- what the patient's responsibilities 11 are, what the provider's responsibilities are. 12 We also actively engage family members to gather 13 collateral information. We regularly check the 14 electronic medical record to see what other types of 15 treatments or co-occurring medical problems the patient 16 may have received or is receiving. 17 So we have a very high level of scrutiny, 18 informed by regular monitoring, which, by the way, was 19 not the way that I was educated in medical school and 20 training. That's something that I have implemented in my 21 practice over time in recognition of the fact that 22 patients can at any point deviate from taking their 23 opioid as prescribed because of the overwhelming pull of 24 opioid medications and the vulnerability that we all have 25 to misuse or become addicted to these medications.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 Q. So the high level of scrutiny that you have 2 implemented in your practice, do you consider those to be 3 best practices? 4 A. I do, yeah. 5 Q. And are those best practices practices that are 6 followed in the State of New York? 7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: I would say in general across the 9 country, including New York, that those have not been 10 standard practices, primarily because defendants created 11 a climate in which opioids were considered effective, 12 safe, and in which we were taught that the risk of 13 addiction through a doctor's prescription is very rare, 14 less than 1 percent. 15 And because of that, doctors came to believe and 16 were educated to believe that they have -- they could 17 have very low levels of scrutiny, as long as they were 18 prescribing for a patient with a legitimate pain 19 condition, as if that conferred some kind of immunity to 20 the problems related to opioids. 21 A lot of my work is trying to implement the best 22 practices akin to what we do in our clinic and which 23 other clinics are doing now as well, as I alluded to 24 earlier in my conversation with the gynecologist in 25 Buffalo, New York. But it will take an infusion of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 2 THE WITNESS: I have not in my clinical 3 experience encountered diversion with such certainty that 4 I felt it was necessary to alert legal authorities. I've 5 had suspicion for diversion and have acted on those 6 suspicions. 7 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: So when you find something 8 suspicious but can't confirm that it's suspicious, your 9 practice is to not report that suspected diversion; is 10 that right? 11 A. That's right, because sometimes my suspicions 12 are unfounded. So, for example, the urine drug screen 13 has a certain sensitivity and specificity which is not 14 100 percent accurate or, you know, maybe the patient 15 missed their dose for a legitimate reason, which they 16 then explained to me. 17 So a negative urine drug screen is evidence of 18 them not taking the medicine, but not because they're 19 diverting it, but because they forgot or they lost their 20 pills or what have you. 21 So, you know, I have to gather as much evidence 22 as I can to make an informed clinical judgment, but as 23 soon as there's evidence of any kind of suspiciousness, I 24 act on that immediately. I discuss it with the patient, 25 I discuss it with their family members, I express the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 resources to provide the education and training and 2 medical infrastructure to implement best practices. 3 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: When you catch diversion, do you 4 alert authorities? 5 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 6 THE WITNESS: Our scrutiny is so close that when 7 I catch diversion in my patients -- and again, it's not 8 even that I have a certainty about diversion. Patients 9 will seldom, if ever, admit to diversion. But a way that 10 I might suspect division is, for example, I do a urine 11 drug screen and the urine drug screen does not detect the 12 opioid that I'm prescribing. And then I'm very worried 13 that the patient is diverting that opioid. 14 Then I will have an informed discussion with 15 them, where I tell them about my concerns. Typically the 16 patient will deny because that's the nature of the beast. 17 And then we will make modifications in the care 18 so that I can more closely steward that medication until 19 I have a level of certainty that the pill is not being 20 diverted. 21 If I can't obtain that level of certainty, then 22 I -- I don't prescribe that medication any longer. I try 23 to find some kind of alternative treatment. 24 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: When you confirm diversion, do 25 you alert legal authorities to that diversion?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 concern to my patient, and I change my prescribing. 2 MR. MOONEY: Move to strike everything after 3 "that's right." 4 Q. Dr. Lembke, the question was: When you find 5 something suspicious but can't confirm that it's -- can't 6 confirm it's suspicious, your practice is to not report 7 that suspected diversion. 8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 9 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Is that right? 10 A. When I find something that's suspicious, my 11 practice is to report it to the patient, to report it to 12 concerned family members, to report it to my 13 interdisciplinary treatment team, to report it to the 14 dispensing pharmacist. That is my standard practice. 15 I do not go to legal authorities because I have 16 never had occasion in which I was so convinced about 17 diversion that harmed -- that had the potential to harm a 18 large number of people, and I felt that I could contain 19 my -- what -- what -- what might be diversion within my 20 clinic by immediately changing my prescribing or my 21 intervention around that patient. 22 Q. What threshold would you look for to be 23 convinced about diversion and harm that you would feel 24 the need to report it? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>

25 (Pages 94 - 97)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: It would depend on the</p> <p>2 circumstances. These are judgment calls. But if I saw a</p> <p>3 consistent repeated pattern of pills that I was</p> <p>4 prescribing not being taken by my patient and ending up</p> <p>5 with somebody else, I would report it.</p> <p>6 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: You never called the police to</p> <p>7 report diversion from your patients?</p> <p>8 A. I am remembering a situation in which I was</p> <p>9 discussing with police a case of diversion, but I don't</p> <p>10 remember if I initiated the call or if somebody else did.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you ever called the DEA to report diversion</p> <p>12 from your patients?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. Who is the last patient of yours who you had</p> <p>15 suspicions was diverting opioids?</p> <p>16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form and invades</p> <p>17 confidentiality.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I can't talk about a</p> <p>19 specific patient scenario.</p> <p>20 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: What condition did the patient</p> <p>21 have?</p> <p>22 A. The patient had opioid use disorder, opioid</p> <p>23 addiction.</p> <p>24 Q. And was that patient with opioid use disorder</p> <p>25 being prescribed opioids?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure about the nuances of</p> <p>3 New York State's rules and regulations regarding</p> <p>4 licensure and prescribing privileges. If it's similar to</p> <p>5 other states, then the Board is involved in licensure as</p> <p>6 well as specifically the DEA is involved in granting</p> <p>7 permission to prescribe controlled substances.</p> <p>8 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Does the New York Board of</p> <p>9 Medicine have the power to investigate doctors?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Can it discipline doctors?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Can the Board of Medicine take away a doctor's</p> <p>14 license?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. If a doctor loses their medical license, can</p> <p>17 they prescribe opioids?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. They can't practice medicine at all in that</p> <p>20 state; right?</p> <p>21 A. That's right.</p> <p>22 Q. Are you familiar with the Federation of State</p> <p>23 Medical Boards?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. What is the Federation of State Medical Boards?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Does every state have a medical board?</p> <p>3 A. To my knowledge, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. What's the New York medical board called?</p> <p>5 A. New York State Medical Board.</p> <p>6 Q. That's what it's called?</p> <p>7 A. I believe so, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Is it true that doctors who -- or excuse me,</p> <p>9 does the New York -- strike that. My microphone fell.</p> <p>10 Does the New York Board of Medicine license</p> <p>11 doctors?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I believe so. I believe they're a</p> <p>13 licensing body as well as a monitoring organization.</p> <p>14 Q. Does the State of New York also license doctors</p> <p>15 who describe pain medications to prescribe those</p> <p>16 medications?</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: There are multiple different</p> <p>19 organizations involved in physician licensure. So the</p> <p>20 State Board is -- is one of those, but when it comes</p> <p>21 specifically to prescribing, the DEA is also involved.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: So there's Board of Medicine</p> <p>23 licensing and the DEA. Does the State of New York also</p> <p>24 license prescribers to engage in controlled substance</p> <p>25 activity?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 A. The Federation of State Medical Boards is the</p> <p>2 umbrella organization for the individual State Medical</p> <p>3 Boards.</p> <p>4 Q. And is the New York State Medical Board a member</p> <p>5 of the Federation of State Medical Boards?</p> <p>6 A. I assume so.</p> <p>7 Q. Are medical boards from all 50 states members of</p> <p>8 the Federation?</p> <p>9 A. I assume so, but I don't know for sure.</p> <p>10 Q. Is CardinalHealth, McKesson, AmerisourceBergen</p> <p>11 or Rochester Drug Co-op a member of the Federation of</p> <p>12 State Medical Boards?</p> <p>13 A. I don't believe so.</p> <p>14 Q. As part of its work overseeing State Medical</p> <p>15 Boards, did the Federation release model guidelines for</p> <p>16 prescribing opioids?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, they did.</p> <p>18 Q. And when did the Federation first issue those</p> <p>19 guidelines?</p> <p>20 A. I do reference that in my report.</p> <p>21 MR. MOONEY: You can take the time to look, but</p> <p>22 you might look at page 26.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Thank you. I appreciate it.</p> <p>24 So the Federation of State Medical Boards</p> <p>25 published the book -- published a book. In 1998, the</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 Federation of State Medical Boards released a policy to 2 reassure doctors that they would not be prosecuted if 3 they prescribed even large amounts of opioids. And then 4 they released a book in 2007 called "Responsible Opioid 5 Prescribing, a Physician's Guide." 6 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Okay. 7 A. Does that answer your question? 8 Q. Sort of. 9 Did the DEA endorse the Federation's model 10 guidelines? 11 A. I don't believe the DEA was involved in 12 endorsing the model guidelines. 13 Q. Do you know if the DEA testified in support of 14 the Federation's model guidelines? 15 A. If they did, I'm -- I'm not aware of that. 16 Q. As part of the Federation's policy, did the 17 model guidelines reassure doctors that they would not be 18 prosecuted if they prescribed large amounts of opioids 19 for the treatment of pain? 20 A. It is certainly true that through the 21 campaigning of the Pain and Policy Study Group from 22 Wisconsin, Drs. David Joranson and June Dahl, promoted by 23 the American Pain Society and funded indirectly by the 24 opioid manufacturers, that there was a lobbying campaign 25 during which Drs. Joranson and Dahl went to different</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 prescribe opioids for their patients to address pain? 2 A. That was true in the late 1990s and early aughts 3 through about 2012 or 2013. I think that's less true 4 now. 5 Q. Did the New York Board of Medicine implement the 6 Federation's model guidelines? 7 A. I don't know. 8 Q. Now, you mentioned a couple moments ago that the 9 Federation also published a book that promoted the use of 10 prescription opioids; is that right? 11 A. That's right. 12 Q. And what was the title of that book? 13 A. Responsible Opioid Prescribing, a Physician's 14 Guide. 15 Q. And when was that book released? 16 A. 2007. 17 Q. Did CardinalHealth, McKesson, AmerisourceBergen 18 or Rochester Drug Co-op provide any funding for that 19 book? 20 A. Not that I'm aware of. 21 Q. The Federation didn't just publish the book 22 Responsible Opioid Prescribing, they distributed copies 23 to State Medical Boards; is that right? 24 A. That's right. 25 Q. And then the State Medical Boards distributed</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 state federation -- different State Medical Boards 2 encouraging them to pass laws and guidelines stating that 3 doctors who prescribed very high amounts of opioids would 4 not be -- would not be punished in any way, as long as 5 they were prescribing those opioids for the treatment of 6 pain. 7 Q. So -- 8 A. Yes. The answer to your question is "yes." 9 Q. Right. In romanette II you say: "In 1998, the 10 Federation of State Medical Boards released a policy to 11 reassure doctors that they would not be prosecuted if 12 they prescribed even large amounts of opioids as long as 13 it was for the treatment of pain." 14 Did I read that correctly? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And that is an opinion that you hold? 17 A. That's correct. 18 Q. Did the Federation urge the State Medical Boards 19 to punish doctors for under-treating pain? 20 A. Yes, they did. 21 Q. Has the New York Board of Medicine ever punished 22 doctors for under-treating pain? 23 A. I'm not aware of specific cases. 24 Q. Are doctors afraid of being disciplined by their 25 State Medical Board and facing lawsuits if they don't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 that book to its licensees? 2 A. I don't know whether they distributed it for 3 free or if it was available for purchase, but it was 4 certainly available to their licensees. 5 Q. So just so I make sure I understand, the 6 Federation of State Medical Boards of all of the State 7 Medical Boards published a treatment guideline and 8 published a book telling doctors that it's generally 9 accepted medical practice to prescribe the opioids as a 10 first-line treatment for chronic pain. 11 Is that accurate? 12 A. So I have read the book Responsible Opioid 13 Prescribing, and I would say that it contains within it 14 many of the misleading promotional messages that I've 15 detailed here in my report, for example, that opioids are 16 an evidence-based treatment for chronic pain. That is a 17 misleading message. That the risk is low or that no dose 18 is too high, et cetera. 19 There is some good information in that book. 20 It's not all bad information. But there's certainly 21 enough bad information in that book to make it suspect. 22 Q. Okay. So just focusing in on the question: The 23 Federation of the State Medical Boards published 24 treatment guidelines and published a book telling doctors 25 that it's generally accepted medical practice to</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 prescribe opioids for chronic pain; is that right?</p> <p>2 A. That's right.</p> <p>3 Q. And is it your opinion that these guidelines</p> <p>4 made the opioid epidemic worse?</p> <p>5 A. They contributed, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And is that because the guidelines largely did</p> <p>7 away with the restrictions that had previously existed on</p> <p>8 how opioids were prescribed?</p> <p>9 A. It's a combination of doing away with the</p> <p>10 Federation of State Medical Boards' level of scrutiny on</p> <p>11 how doctors were prescribing opioids, condoning high</p> <p>12 volume prescribing and high-dose prescribing.</p> <p>13 But I think even more importantly, that book was</p> <p>14 one of many pieces that really changed the culture around</p> <p>15 opioid prescribing, such that prescribing very high doses</p> <p>16 and very large volumes, even for minor and chronic pain</p> <p>17 conditions, became normative in medicine.</p> <p>18 Q. Is the New York Medical Board still a member of</p> <p>19 the Federation of State Medical Boards?</p> <p>20 A. I don't know. I assume so, but I don't know.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you know if the New York Attorney General has</p> <p>22 sued the Federation of State Medical Boards for</p> <p>23 publishing guidelines that contributed to the opioid</p> <p>24 epidemic?</p> <p>25 A. I'm not aware of that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 certain quality measures and how to meet those quality</p> <p>2 measures, and hospitals and clinics who meet those</p> <p>3 measures can be accredited by the Joint Commission and</p> <p>4 get a kind of seal of approval, which is very important,</p> <p>5 has been historically very important for healthcare</p> <p>6 institutions.</p> <p>7 And that seal of approval not only is a public</p> <p>8 statement to the quality of their care, but again, also</p> <p>9 makes them eligible for certain types of reimbursement.</p> <p>10 Q. And so does meeting those quality measures</p> <p>11 depend on following the best practices that are</p> <p>12 determined by the Joint Commission?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, meeting those quality measures is dependent</p> <p>14 on following best practices determined by -- as</p> <p>15 determined by the Joint Commission and as measured in the</p> <p>16 way that the Joint Commission says they need to be</p> <p>17 measured.</p> <p>18 Q. And has the Joint Commission introduced</p> <p>19 standards for the treatment of pain?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. In 2001, the Joint Commission made pain a</p> <p>21 quality measure and implicitly suggested the ways in</p> <p>22 which hospitals and clinics should implement that quality</p> <p>23 measure.</p> <p>24 Q. And did the Joint Commission's quality measures</p> <p>25 promote more liberal prescribing of opioids for pain?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 Q. Have you publicly condemned your colleagues on</p> <p>2 State Medical Boards for promoting the model guidelines?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Where?</p> <p>5 A. I've given talks, and in my book, I talk about</p> <p>6 the role of the Federation of State Medical Boards. I</p> <p>7 wouldn't say I've publicly condemned certain individual</p> <p>8 colleagues, but as one brick, you know, in a larger, you</p> <p>9 know, wall of this problem, the Federation of State</p> <p>10 Medical Boards has played a role in contributing to the</p> <p>11 opioid epidemic in the ways that I have just said and</p> <p>12 also in the ways that I detail in my report.</p> <p>13 Q. Are you familiar with the Joint Commission on</p> <p>14 Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>16 Q. It's often referred to as the Joint Commission?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. What is the Joint Commission?</p> <p>19 A. The Joint Commission is a non-profit</p> <p>20 organization that was designed to accredit hospitals to</p> <p>21 ensure that patients are receiving a high level of care.</p> <p>22 And hospitals and clinics are eager to get Joint</p> <p>23 Commission accreditation in order to, for example, be</p> <p>24 eligible for funds from Medicare and Medicaid.</p> <p>25 So what the Joint Commission does is establish</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 A. Yes. It was a combination not only of making</p> <p>2 pain a quality measure, but also dispensing to hospitals</p> <p>3 for a fee educational materials obtained from opioid</p> <p>4 manufacturers on how that could be done. And those --</p> <p>5 those quote/unquote learning materials contained much of</p> <p>6 the misinformation propagated by defendants that led to</p> <p>7 this opioid epidemic, things like doctors who don't</p> <p>8 prescribe opioids for pain are suffering from</p> <p>9 quote/unquote opioid phobia and implied irrational fear</p> <p>10 of opioids.</p> <p>11 The idea that every pain patient can be assessed</p> <p>12 using the pain scale from 1 to 10, and that should be</p> <p>13 assessed using that pain scale, whether or not they</p> <p>14 appear to have any kind of pain.</p> <p>15 The misrepresentation of the risk of opioids,</p> <p>16 including that patients -- that it's very rare for</p> <p>17 patients to get addicted to opioids as long as they're</p> <p>18 being prescribed by a doctor, when, in fact, there is</p> <p>19 good evidence that predates this epidemic and has been</p> <p>20 validated in ongoing research that the risk is actually</p> <p>21 very common among patients treated for pain. That's all</p> <p>22 in my report.</p> <p>23 MR. MOONEY: Move to strike everything after</p> <p>24 "yes."</p> <p>25 Q. My question was: Did the Joint Commission's</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 quality measures promote more liberal prescribing of 2 opioids for pain? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And is it a practical effect of those standards 5 that hospitals had to follow them or risk losing 6 accreditation? 7 A. Yes, I believe that's true. 8 Q. Are you familiar with the concept of a vital 9 sign? 10 A. Yes, I am. 11 Q. What is a vital sign? 12 A. A vital sign is an objective measure of a 13 patient's health, including heart rate, breathing rate, 14 blood pressure and temperature. Those four have been the 15 classic and enduring vital signs in medicine for decades. 16 The Joint Commission advocated pain measure and 17 the 1 to 10 pain scale as another way to -- as a way that 18 doctors should measure pain, and that pain should be like 19 the fifth vital sign. That was the terminology. I don't 20 think the Joint Commission invented that, but in their 21 collaboration with the American Pain Society and key 22 opinion leaders, came up with the idea of pain as the 23 fifth vital sign, and the Commission adopted and 24 disseminated that idea in order to meet their quality 25 measure. So yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 also eager to have their patients like them. And so that 2 can make that dynamic between doctor and patient and 3 opioid prescribing very complicated. 4 Because opioids can be effective for pain in the 5 short-term, when doctors prescribe them, patients do 6 endorse significant, immediate relief, and that feels 7 really good for doctors. 8 And then that's -- the complexity there is added 9 to by the fact that many hospitals ask their patients to 10 rate their doctors on, you know, on how good they are, as 11 well as there are national surveys asking patients to 12 rate the hospital, did your hospital or your clinic do 13 everything in their power to address your pain. 14 And then those ratings are communicated back to 15 doctors, and if they're not good ratings, then doctors 16 really are called to task on why their patients are not 17 rating them highly, which can contribute to opioid 18 overprescribing. 19 Q. Have you quantified the impact that patient 20 satisfaction surveys have on doctors' decisions to 21 prescribe opioids? 22 A. What do you mean by "quantify"? 23 Q. Well, have you -- can you provide a percentage 24 of a doctor's decision making for which patient 25 satisfaction surveys played a role in prescribing</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 Q. And what is the significance of treating pain as 2 a vital sign? 3 A. The significance of treating pain as a vital 4 sign is that any patient who walks through your office or 5 clinic or emergency room or hospital door for any reason 6 should have their pain assessed along with their blood 7 pressure, heart rate, temperature, et cetera, just as the 8 standard of care. 9 Unfortunately, there's no evidence to support 10 the use of the visual analog scale, or the 1 to 10 pain 11 scale, in terms of pain outcomes. And in fact, data show 12 that asking patients to rate their pain on a scale from 1 13 to 10 just leads to more opioid prescribing and doesn't 14 improve pain outcomes. 15 Q. So did treating pain as a vital sign encourage 16 prescribing more opioids for pain? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Do patient satisfaction surveys influence 19 doctors to prescribe opioids more liberally? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. How do they do that? 22 A. As I talk about in my report and also in my 23 book, doctors are kind of natural pleasers and natural 24 helpers, and they are very compassionate people, by and 25 large, and they want to help their patients. And they're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 opioids? 2 A. I can't quantify it numerically, but based on my 3 personal experience, my clinical experience, and also my 4 many conversations with doctors, patient satisfaction 5 surveys have played a big role. 6 Q. Are you aware that the DEA sets a quota on the 7 number of prescription opioids that can be manufactured 8 in a given year? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Do you agree that the DEA's quota impacts the 11 supply of opioids that are available? 12 A. I really think it's out of my area to opine on 13 that. There will be other experts who will speak to 14 specific quotas and the legal obligations of 15 manufacturers vis-à-vis quotas. That's not -- not really 16 my area. 17 Q. My question wasn't about the manufacturer's role 18 in the quota. My question was just do you believe. I 19 understand there may be other experts who are going to 20 opine on this. 21 My question: Do you agree that the DEA quota 22 has an impact on the supply of prescription opioids that 23 are available in the market? 24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 25 THE WITNESS: Yes. That makes sense.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Should the DEA's quota be lower?</p> <p>2 A. I don't feel that I really know enough about the</p> <p>3 impact of quotas to be able to offer an opinion on that.</p> <p>4 Q. On page 58 of your report, you write that the</p> <p>5 best evidence available shows that the risk of addiction</p> <p>6 in patients taking opioids for chronic pain is between</p> <p>7 10 percent and 30 percent.</p> <p>8 Do you see that?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Assuming that those percentages are accurate,</p> <p>11 what is the appropriate number of prescription opioids</p> <p>12 that a distributor should ship to a pharmacy?</p> <p>13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: That's really outside -- those</p> <p>15 calculations are outside of my expertise.</p> <p>16 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: What percentage of Americans</p> <p>17 have ever taken a prescription opioid as prescribed by a</p> <p>18 doctor?</p> <p>19 A. So I do talk about that a little bit in my</p> <p>20 report. Let me refer to that section.</p> <p>21 So in 2016, I coauthored an article on the use</p> <p>22 of opioid agonist therapy in the treatment of opioid use</p> <p>23 disorder, but as part of the quantitative analysis that</p> <p>24 we did for this publication, we also assessed the</p> <p>25 percentage of Medicare Part D enrollees who fill at least</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 pharmaceutical opioid industry and in the medical</p> <p>2 profession and representatives in Public Health and</p> <p>3 across the nation, to try to zero in on what that lower</p> <p>4 number should be.</p> <p>5 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Do you know if any of the</p> <p>6 10 million Part D Medicare enrollees in your report had</p> <p>7 their claims rejected?</p> <p>8 A. I don't know. We did not analyze that.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you agree that heroin and fentanyl use in the</p> <p>10 United States has increased over the past five years?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Is nonmedical prescription opioid use a</p> <p>13 significant factor that contributed to the increase in</p> <p>14 heroin and fentanyl use?</p> <p>15 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Both medical and nonmedical use</p> <p>17 have contributed to the use in heroin and illicit</p> <p>18 fentanyl use.</p> <p>19 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: What is "nonmedical prescription</p> <p>20 opioid use"?</p> <p>21 A. Nonmedical opioid use means taking an opioid in</p> <p>22 any way other than indicated by the doctor and by the</p> <p>23 prescription.</p> <p>24 Q. Between medical and nonmedical prescription</p> <p>25 opioid use, which one of those two has played a larger</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 one opioid prescription in any given year, and we</p> <p>2 calculated that more than 10 million Part D Medicare</p> <p>3 enrollees are exposed to a prescription opioid in any</p> <p>4 given year.</p> <p>5 And the Medicare Part D sample is a good sample</p> <p>6 because Medicare Part D recipients can be found across</p> <p>7 the country. So it's a very representative sample of the</p> <p>8 US population.</p> <p>9 And although I know that doesn't specifically</p> <p>10 answer your question of what percentage of Americans have</p> <p>11 ever taken a prescription opioid, it's a very large</p> <p>12 number of individuals who have been prescribed an opioid.</p> <p>13 I can't give you an exact percentage.</p> <p>14 And this -- this data point conveys or</p> <p>15 illustrates that we're talking about tens of millions of</p> <p>16 Americans.</p> <p>17 Q. And in your opinion, is that tens of millions of</p> <p>18 Americans number too high?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. What should the number be?</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: It's hard for me to say at this</p> <p>23 juncture what that number should be. I think it should</p> <p>24 be lower. Exactly how much lower, I'm not sure, but I</p> <p>25 think it is our responsibility both, you know, in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 contribution in heroin and fentanyl use?</p> <p>2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Both have played a very</p> <p>4 significant role. Legitimate prescription opioid use can</p> <p>5 lead a patient to engage in nonmedical prescription</p> <p>6 opioid use, which increases their risk 40-fold then of</p> <p>7 progressing to heroin use, for the Compton 2016 article.</p> <p>8 There's also good evidence via the McCabe 2017</p> <p>9 reference in my report that medical use of prescription</p> <p>10 opioids actually precedes nonmedical use, and that</p> <p>11 nonmedical use followed by medical use in the McCabe 2019</p> <p>12 article exacerbates the development of a substance use</p> <p>13 disorder.</p> <p>14 There's also the scenario in which people in the</p> <p>15 last three decades, growing numbers have engaged in</p> <p>16 nonmedical use because of diversion. People who got</p> <p>17 pills from a drug dealer or from a friend at school or</p> <p>18 from grandma's medicine cabinet. People who did not</p> <p>19 interface at all with the medical community, which really</p> <p>20 speaks to the oversupply of opioids broadly in our</p> <p>21 society being a major factor in this epidemic.</p> <p>22 Q. The Muhuri report, though, said that 70 percent</p> <p>23 of misusers used illegal drugs before they used opioids;</p> <p>24 isn't that right?</p> <p>25 A. Go to that.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 So as I state in my report, in a study based on 2 the National Survey of Drug Use and Health Data -- this 3 is page 96 of my report -- from 2002 to 2011, the 4 incidence of heroin use among people who reported prior 5 nonmedical use of prescription opioids was 19 times as 6 high as the incidence among persons who reported no 7 previous nonmedical use. 8 So that's an important data point to show the 9 clear association between nonmedical use of prescription 10 opioids and heroin use. But this is also an incidence 11 study so it doesn't capture the full prevalence of 12 individuals who -- in the population who have an opioid 13 use disorder or use heroin. 14 So it's an important data point to show the 15 association between nonmedical use and heroin use, but 16 there's also a very strong association between medical 17 use and nonmedical use and then the progression to heroin 18 use. 19 If you look at page 86 of my report, McCabe 20 2017. McCabe writes that: "We found that the majority 21 of nonmedical users of prescription opioids involved a 22 history of medical use, and this finding should provide 23 some concern to health professionals who prescribe opioid 24 medications to adolescents, given the serious health 25 consequences associated with nonmedical use of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 2013, marked for identification.) 2 THE WITNESS: Do you have a page that you quoted 3 from? 4 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Yes. 5 First, can you identify what's been marked as 6 Exhibit 4 to your deposition? 7 A. Yes. This is Muhuri, "Associations of 8 Nonmedical Pain Reliever Use and Initiation of Heroin Use 9 in the United States." 10 Q. Now if you would turn to the page that ends at 11 the bottom in 6042, Table 6. 12 A. Uh-huh. 13 Q. Just before we talk about that page, I just want 14 to clarify. This Exhibit 4 is the report that you cite 15 in footnote 410 of your report? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Okay. So Table 6 lays out the percentage 18 distribution of past-year nonmedical pain reliever use 19 among persons age 12 to 49 at risk for initiation of 20 nonmedical pain reliever use by prior drug use status. 21 Is that right? 22 A. Uh-huh, uh-huh. 23 Q. And under the "no heroin use prior to NMPR use, 24 is "NMPR" -- 25 A. Uh-huh.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 prescription opioids." 2 So there is a very clear stepping-stone effect 3 from medical use to nonmedical use to heroin use. That's 4 not the only pathway. There's also a pathway that begins 5 with nonmedical use, and that's become increasingly more 6 prevalent because of the increased supply, and that then 7 leads to heroin use. 8 So there's -- those -- those things are closely 9 intertwined. 10 I would also say that these pieces of evidence 11 from the peer-reviewed literature support my clinical 12 experience, in which I have had countless patients report 13 to me that their opioid addiction began with a 14 prescription from a well-intended healthcare provider for 15 the treatment of pain. 16 Q. The Muhuri 2013 report found that more than 17 70 percent of heroin users started with illicit drugs 18 prior to their nonmedical prescription use; is that 19 right? 20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 21 THE WITNESS: Could I see? I don't have the 22 article right in front of me. I believe you, but it 23 would be nice to look at the actual article. 24 MR. MOONEY: Mark this as 4, I think. 25 (Exhibit 4, CBHSQ Date Review, SAMHSA, August</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 Q. -- nonmedical pain reliever use? 2 A. Uh-huh. 3 Q. It says: "Other illicit drug use" -- "drugs 4 used prior to NMPR use." 5 Do you see that? 6 A. Uh-huh. 7 Q. If you go to the right, under the column 2002 to 8 2011, it says 71.8 percent; is that right? 9 A. Uh-huh. 10 Q. And so does this table say that 71.8 of persons 11 who did not use heroin before using nonmedical pain 12 relievers -- or excuse me -- using pain relievers for 13 nonmedical use, were using other illicit drugs before 14 eliciting nonmedical pain reliever use? 15 A. Yes, it does say that. 16 Q. And then footnote 2, which follows other illicit 17 drugs, reads: "Other illicit drugs include marijuana, 18 hashish, cocaine, including crack, hallucinogens and 19 inhalants." 20 Did I read that right? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. Of all the people -- you can set that aside. 23 Of all the people who get an opioid prescription 24 from their doctor, how many go on to use heroin or 25 fentanyl?</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 A. Well, that's a different question.</p> <p>2 Q. It is.</p> <p>3 A. That's based -- yeah. So I think you've asked</p> <p>4 that before. The most reliable version of that -- let me</p> <p>5 try to answer, again, we're better.</p> <p>6 So the most reliable data show that</p> <p>7 approximately 10 to 30 percent of patients treated with</p> <p>8 an opioid for pain have some kind of opioid use disorder,</p> <p>9 and it's the natural history of the disease of addiction</p> <p>10 that patients will over time need more and more of that</p> <p>11 opioid to get the same effect and that they will look for</p> <p>12 cheaper and more readily available sources.</p> <p>13 So when -- once people are addicted through a</p> <p>14 prescription opioid, it is not uncommon for them to then</p> <p>15 progress to heroin, and we do know that our heroin supply</p> <p>16 has been adulterated by illicit fentanyl.</p> <p>17 And so, you know, I don't have data exactly on</p> <p>18 how many of those patients addicted through a</p> <p>19 prescription progressed to heroin, but the odds ratios</p> <p>20 from Compton 2016 show that they are 40 times more likely</p> <p>21 to progress to heroin use having been exposed to a</p> <p>22 prescription opioid.</p> <p>23 And again, the McCabe and my own experience</p> <p>24 suggests that a very large proportion of individuals who</p> <p>25 have become addicted to heroin in the last 20 to 30 years</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 fentanyl; is that correct?</p> <p>2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Well, I did prescribe a number</p> <p>4 that I think is very evidence based and reliable on what</p> <p>5 percentage of patients prescribed an opioid by their</p> <p>6 doctor for a legitimate pain condition will go on to</p> <p>7 develop an opioid addiction, somewhere between 10 and</p> <p>8 30 percent, which is very common.</p> <p>9 And then if we extrapolate from that that we've</p> <p>10 got tens of millions of Americans, you know, who are</p> <p>11 exposed to opioids, you know, you could come up with a</p> <p>12 number for that.</p> <p>13 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: Can you come up with a number</p> <p>14 for that sitting here today?</p> <p>15 A. I'd rather not give a specific number. I think</p> <p>16 the evidence is in my report and based on percentages.</p> <p>17 Q. So the answer is "no," today, sitting here, you</p> <p>18 can't give a number?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, that's right.</p> <p>20 Q. On page 85 of your report in paragraph D, you</p> <p>21 write: "It is important to recognize that although many</p> <p>22 of the communities hit hardest by the opioid epidemic</p> <p>23 were already struggling with serious social and economic</p> <p>24 problems, the sudden availability of easy access to</p> <p>25 opioids, initially in prescription pill form, contributed</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 started out with a prevention opioid.</p> <p>2 There's also an article that I reference here</p> <p>3 based on a survey study showing that three-quarters of</p> <p>4 heroin users say that their first exposure to opioids was</p> <p>5 a prescription opioid. And that's page 96, Cicero, JAMA</p> <p>6 Psychiatry 2014.</p> <p>7 And I'll just read from that. "In the 1960s,</p> <p>8 80 percent of opioid users reported that their first</p> <p>9 exposure to opioids was in the form of heroin. By the</p> <p>10 2000s, however, 75 percent of opioid users reported that</p> <p>11 their first exposure to opioids was in the form of</p> <p>12 prescription painkillers," really demonstrating a massive</p> <p>13 paradigm shift in terms of the heroin users in this</p> <p>14 country today compared to the 1960s.</p> <p>15 MR. MOONEY: Move to strike all of that.</p> <p>16 Q. Dr. Lembke, my question was: How many people</p> <p>17 who get opioid prescriptions from their doctor end up</p> <p>18 going on to use heroin or fentanyl?</p> <p>19 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I couldn't give you an absolute</p> <p>21 number. I've tried to suggest an answer through</p> <p>22 percentages.</p> <p>23 Q. BY MR. MOONEY: So sitting here today, you</p> <p>24 cannot provide a number of how many people who are</p> <p>25 prescribed opioids by their doctor end up using heroin or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 to the economic and social devastation of many towns</p> <p>2 across America."</p> <p>3 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. You're not an economist, are you?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Are you a sociologist?</p> <p>8 A. Armchair sociologist?</p> <p>9 Q. Trained -- trained sociologist?</p> <p>10 A. I don't have any degrees in sociology, per se.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you done any independent analysis of</p> <p>12 economic and social devastation across many towns in</p> <p>13 America?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you done any independent analysis of the</p> <p>16 causes of any economic and social devastation across many</p> <p>17 towns in America?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you have any other opinions about</p> <p>20 distributors that are not listed in your report, that you</p> <p>21 intend to offer in this litigation?</p> <p>22 A. My opinions in the report as well as in my</p> <p>23 testimony today are the opinions I intend to offer in</p> <p>24 this litigation.</p> <p>25 Q. When we started this deposition, I handed you</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 what was marked as Exhibit 1.</p> <p>2 Do you remember that?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And you said Exhibit 1 was a -- or excuse me,</p> <p>5 Exhibit 2. I meant to say Exhibit 2. I handed you</p> <p>6 Exhibit 2.</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And that was your report from your -- from this</p> <p>9 case; is that right?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>11 Q. And you have not referred to that report in the</p> <p>12 course of answering your -- answering my questions during</p> <p>13 today's deposition, that physical copy that is marked as</p> <p>14 Exhibit 2; right?</p> <p>15 A. That's correct.</p> <p>16 Q. You came in with a binder today that includes</p> <p>17 Post-It notes and notations?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 MR. MOONEY: I would like to mark that document</p> <p>20 as Exhibit 5 to this deposition.</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: No objection.</p> <p>22 (Exhibit 5, Dr. Lembke binder, notes and</p> <p>23 notations, marked for identification.)</p> <p>24 MR. MOONEY: We can take a break.</p> <p>25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Are you releasing the witness or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you aware of any pharmacy presenter at the</p> <p>3 2001 CME that you attended?</p> <p>4 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>5 Q. And am I correct in your report for this case,</p> <p>6 you have not identified any marketing statements by</p> <p>7 retail pharmacy defendants; correct?</p> <p>8 A. That's correct.</p> <p>9 Q. In preparing your report for this case, did you</p> <p>10 consider any documents produced from the files of a</p> <p>11 pharmacy defendant?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Have you reviewed the testimony of any employees</p> <p>14 or witnesses from a pharmacy defendant in connection with</p> <p>15 your work in this case?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. Earlier today you had some comments regarding</p> <p>18 the responsibility of pharmacists. I want to follow up</p> <p>19 on that, okay?</p> <p>20 You mentioned that pharmacies also have a</p> <p>21 responsibility in the opioid supply chain to make sure</p> <p>22 that a patient customers are not being harmed by the</p> <p>23 opioids that are dispensed.</p> <p>24 Do you recall saying that?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I do.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 not? You're just going to go think about it?</p> <p>2 MR. MOONEY: We've got to go see what that</p> <p>3 document is.</p> <p>4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Fair enough.</p> <p>5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the</p> <p>6 time is 11:27 a.m.</p> <p>7 (Lunch recess.)</p> <p>8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record. The time</p> <p>9 is 12:16 p.m.</p> <p>10 MR. MOONEY: Dr. Lembke, I have no further</p> <p>11 questions. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: You're very welcome.</p> <p>13 EXAMINATION</p> <p>14 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Good afternoon, Dr. Lembke.</p> <p>15 A. Good afternoon.</p> <p>16 Q. My name is Ed Carter. We have not met before,</p> <p>17 but I represent Walmart, and I have some questions to you</p> <p>18 today, okay?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Can you identify any false or misleading claim</p> <p>21 about opioids made by one of the retail pharmacy</p> <p>22 defendants in this case?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you aware of any marketing of opioids</p> <p>25 conducted by any of the retail chain pharmacy defendants?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Is that opinion reflected anywhere in</p> <p>2 your report for this case?</p> <p>3 A. It's reflected broadly in my opinion that the</p> <p>4 oversupply of opioids to Americans has been a major</p> <p>5 contributor to this epidemic of addiction and overdose</p> <p>6 death.</p> <p>7 Q. Does that specific claim or opinion, is that</p> <p>8 noted anywhere in your report, the one that I just read</p> <p>9 to you?</p> <p>10 A. I don't specify a pharmacy in my report.</p> <p>11 Q. And in your report, you do not mention any</p> <p>12 pharmacy by name; correct?</p> <p>13 A. That is correct.</p> <p>14 Q. With respect to the statement you made this</p> <p>15 morning regarding pharmacy responsibility to make sure</p> <p>16 that patients are not being harmed by the opioids that</p> <p>17 are dispensed, do you have any opinion in this case that</p> <p>18 any of the pharmacy defendants did not comply with that</p> <p>19 responsibility you articulated?</p> <p>20 A. I am aware based on reports in the lay press and</p> <p>21 in other non-confidential documents and readings that I</p> <p>22 have done that there are rogue pharmacies out there</p> <p>23 dispensing very large quantities of opioids, far more</p> <p>24 opioids than can be justified by the need for analgesia</p> <p>25 in that community, and I don't know if any of those are</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 either -- are Walgreens or Walmart.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Do you know who the pharmacy defendants</p> <p>3 are in the case brought by Nassau County?</p> <p>4 A. I believe Walgreens and Walmart are the pharmacy</p> <p>5 defendants in the case brought by Nassau County. CVS may</p> <p>6 also be included, but I'm not sure.</p> <p>7 Q. All right. Any other defendants that you're</p> <p>8 aware of as defendants in the Nassau County case?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know who the pharmacy defendants are in</p> <p>11 the Suffolk County case?</p> <p>12 A. I believe it's the same pharmacies.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Any evidence that Walgreens, Walmart or</p> <p>14 CVS in Nassau County failed to comply with the</p> <p>15 responsibility to ensure that their patients, customers,</p> <p>16 were not being harmed by the opioids that they dispensed?</p> <p>17 A. I don't have knowledge of the specific</p> <p>18 pharmacies in those counties.</p> <p>19 Q. Fair to say you have not conducted any</p> <p>20 systematic analysis or review of pharmacy dispensing data</p> <p>21 in Nassau County?</p> <p>22 A. Let me look at my report. I have reviewed data</p> <p>23 on page 17 as pertains to the morphine milligram</p> <p>24 equivalents dispensed in the state of New York, including</p> <p>25 Nassau and Suffolk Counties, as well as the duration of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 pharmacy dispensing data.</p> <p>2 Q. Have you heard of ISOP?</p> <p>3 A. What does "ISOP" stand for?</p> <p>4 Q. I'm asking you. Have you heard of that acronym?</p> <p>5 A. Oh. I don't know the acronym. I might know if</p> <p>6 you tell me what it stands for. It might ring a bell.</p> <p>7 Q. Have you reviewed the State of New York's PMP</p> <p>8 drug data?</p> <p>9 A. Is that the prescription drug monitoring</p> <p>10 database in the State of New York?</p> <p>11 Q. Yes.</p> <p>12 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>13 Q. And with respect to any specific pharmacy in</p> <p>14 Nassau or Suffolk, have you analyzed their dispensing</p> <p>15 history to determine whether that pharmacy has adequately</p> <p>16 attended to the safety of their customers?</p> <p>17 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>18 Q. You also discussed earlier today the following</p> <p>19 statement. You said that pharmacists have a</p> <p>20 responsibility to patients to ensure that the</p> <p>21 prescription is appropriate, that it is a true</p> <p>22 prescription, and that it is not a prescription that will</p> <p>23 harm the patient.</p> <p>24 Do you recall giving that testimony?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I do.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 prescriptions, namely, that in the state of New York,</p> <p>2 opioid prescribing increased from 101 morphine milligram</p> <p>3 equivalents in 1997 to 442 morphine milligram equivalents</p> <p>4 by 2006, and again increased to 492 morphine milligram</p> <p>5 equivalents per person in 2016, and this correlates with</p> <p>6 the four-fold increase in opioid-related deaths in the</p> <p>7 state of New York in that time period.</p> <p>8 Also, the length of opioid prescriptions</p> <p>9 increased during that time, going from 15 days in 2006 to</p> <p>10 19 days of opioids in 2017.</p> <p>11 I also have CDC data looking at the opioid</p> <p>12 prescribing rates specifically in Nassau County, which</p> <p>13 increased from 47 opioid prescriptions per 100 persons to</p> <p>14 51 opioid prescriptions per 100 persons from 2006 to</p> <p>15 2011.</p> <p>16 And in Suffolk County, I reviewed data showing</p> <p>17 that opioid prescriptions increased from 61 opioids per</p> <p>18 100 persons to 70 prescriptions per 100 persons in 2011.</p> <p>19 Those are data that I reviewed specifically</p> <p>20 regarding opioid prescribing in Nassau and Suffolk County</p> <p>21 and New York, in the state of New York.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you know, are any of those data sources</p> <p>23 pharmacy dispensing data sources?</p> <p>24 A. I believe that the CDC data, the number of</p> <p>25 opioid prescriptions per 100 persons is based on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Is that -- are any of those statements</p> <p>2 contained expressly in your report for this case?</p> <p>3 A. Not expressly in my report, no.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know whether Walmart -- strike that.</p> <p>5 Do you have any opinion whether Walmart</p> <p>6 fulfilled its responsibility, as you described it, to</p> <p>7 ensure that its patients had appropriate prescriptions,</p> <p>8 true prescriptions, and prescriptions that would not harm</p> <p>9 the patients?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And what is your opinion?</p> <p>12 A. I considered Walmart to be a critical actor in</p> <p>13 the opioid supply chain, and the behavior of all the</p> <p>14 defendants in the opioid supply chain contributed to the</p> <p>15 oversupply that was the primary factor in driving the</p> <p>16 current opioid epidemic. So Walmart does bear some</p> <p>17 responsibility in the epidemic.</p> <p>18 MR. CARTER: All right. I'll respectfully move</p> <p>19 to strike and reask my question.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you know whether Walmart fulfilled its</p> <p>21 responsibility, as you described it, to ensure that</p> <p>22 patients had appropriate prescriptions in Nassau County</p> <p>23 or Suffolk County?</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I believe that Walmart did not</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 fulfill its responsibility because Walmart is part of the 2 opioid supply chain. 3 Q. BY MR. CARTER: So what patient, either a name 4 or a case number, did Walmart fail to fulfill its 5 responsibility to ensure that it was an appropriate 6 prescription and a true prescription in Nassau and 7 Suffolk County? 8 A. I don't have those details. 9 Q. And where in your report do you articulate the 10 opinion that Walmart failed to fulfill its responsibility 11 in those regards? 12 A. I don't specifically name Walmart in my report. 13 Q. Same question with respect to Walgreens and CVS. 14 A. Same answer. 15 Q. Okay. You also said that pharmacists have a 16 responsibility to check drug interactions and 17 indications. 18 Do you recall that? 19 A. Yes, I do. 20 Q. Is that opinion reflected anywhere in your 21 report? 22 A. Not specifically. 23 Q. And do you have any evidence that Walmart, 24 Walgreens or CVS failed to check drug interactions or 25 indications for any patient in Nassau or Suffolk County?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 A. Yes, I do. 2 Q. Do you know how Walmart pharmacists performed 3 their role of educating patients about the risks and 4 benefits of prescription opioids in Nassau County or 5 Suffolk County? 6 A. No. 7 Q. Have you studied that for any pharmacy defendant 8 in the Nassau County or Suffolk County case? 9 A. No, I haven't. 10 Q. Do you have any knowledge of what information 11 pharmacists in Nassau County provide to patients at the 12 time of dispensing prescription opioids during the 13 relevant time periods for the Nassau County case? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Same question for Suffolk County pharmacists. 16 A. Same answer. 17 Q. You also testified that pharmacists have a 18 health-safety relationship with their patients. 19 Do you recall that? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion -- well, strike 22 that. 23 Does that statement appear anywhere in your 24 expert report for this case? 25 A. I don't believe so, no.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 A. I -- pursuant to my prior response, I think that 2 applies here. To the extent that Walmart, Walgreens or 3 CVS are key in the opioid supply chain, they bear some 4 responsibility for the opioid epidemic. But I don't have 5 specific information on specific pharmacists in the 6 Suffolk or Nassau counties. 7 Q. Did I -- what in my question led you to conclude 8 I was asking about responsibility? 9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 10 THE WITNESS: Because your question was a 11 follow-up to my response earlier in the deposition where 12 I said that pharmacists bear some responsibility and that 13 there are precautions that pharmacists can make -- can 14 take. Sorry. 15 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Do you have any understanding of 16 the role of community pharmacists as individual license 17 holders versus corporate policies for retail pharmacy or 18 pharmacy chains? Is that an area of your expertise? 19 A. I would say I'm more familiar with the 20 responsibilities of individual pharmacists, having 21 interacted with them over my 20-plus-year career. 22 Q. Now, you also said that pharmacists play an 23 important role in educating patients about the risks and 24 benefits of medications. 25 Do you recall that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 Q. Do you have an opinion whether Walmart or any 2 pharmacy defendant violated in some way the health-safety 3 relationship with patients? 4 A. Again, to the extent that pharmacists are an 5 important link in the opioid supply chain, and given the 6 data of overdose deaths and addiction in Nassau -- Nassau 7 and Suffolk counties, I think it's fair to say that every 8 member of that opioid supply chain failed to some extent 9 in their responsibilities vis-à-vis their patients and 10 the public in that community. 11 Q. And does that opinion appear anywhere in your 12 report? 13 A. Not specifically, but I do talk at length in my 14 report about supply of opioids and access to opioids as a 15 major risk factor for addiction to opioids. I have an 16 entire section in my report called "The Tsunami Effect," 17 which specifically refers to the rising tide of the 18 number of pills in the community, increasing access both 19 through legitimate and illicit means, putting the 20 population at risk. 21 Q. Sitting here today, are you able to assign a 22 numeric value, either a percentage or a raw number, of 23 instances in which you contend a pharmacy defendant in 24 Nassau County failed to fulfill the health-safety 25 relationship with patient-customers?</p>

35 (Pages 134 - 137)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 A. I can't put a number on it, but I believe that</p> <p>2 the pharmacies bear some -- some blame.</p> <p>3 Q. Same question for Suffolk County.</p> <p>4 A. Yeah, same answer.</p> <p>5 Q. Do the doctors who wrote prescriptions in Nassau</p> <p>6 County bear responsibility and some measure of blame?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, they do.</p> <p>8 Q. Same question for Suffolk.</p> <p>9 A. Same answer.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. You also noted earlier that pharmacists</p> <p>11 should be aware of the CDC guidelines that opioid should</p> <p>12 not be used as first-line treatment.</p> <p>13 Do you recall that?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know whether any Walmart pharmacist in</p> <p>16 Nassau County was unaware of those CDC guidelines?</p> <p>17 A. No, I don't have information at that level of</p> <p>18 specificity.</p> <p>19 Q. Any opinion that any pharmacist for any of the</p> <p>20 pharmacy defendants in the Nassau or Suffolk County case</p> <p>21 was unaware of the CDC guidelines?</p> <p>22 A. I have no specific knowledge about that.</p> <p>23 Q. You also mentioned that pharmacists should have</p> <p>24 good old common sense.</p> <p>25 Do you recall that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 To the extent that the pharmacists in Suffolk</p> <p>2 and Nassau County were filling prescriptions for very</p> <p>3 high doses of opioids or for very long duration or in</p> <p>4 combination with benzodiazepines or in combination with</p> <p>5 other sedative hypnotic-type drugs, increasing that</p> <p>6 individual's risk of accidental overdose death, that</p> <p>7 pharmacist had some responsibility.</p> <p>8 Q. Do either of those scenarios appear anywhere in</p> <p>9 your report?</p> <p>10 A. Those scenarios are implied in my report in my</p> <p>11 discussion of the problem of oversupply, the ways in</p> <p>12 which healthcare providers were duped based on a</p> <p>13 misrepresentation of the science regarding the safety and</p> <p>14 efficacy of opioids.</p> <p>15 The evidence that I've cited in my report and in</p> <p>16 this deposition regarding the large increase of opioids</p> <p>17 in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, data showing that an</p> <p>18 increase in opioid prescribing in a given geographic</p> <p>19 region correlate with increased rates of addiction and</p> <p>20 overdose death in those counties, that's all implied.</p> <p>21 Also, I would just say that in my greater body</p> <p>22 of work, including in my book and other talks I've given</p> <p>23 and other peer-reviewed literature that I've written, I</p> <p>24 have talked at length about not the role of pharmacists</p> <p>25 specifically, but the role in general of healthcare</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>2 Q. Does that appear anywhere in your report?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Any evidence that a Walmart pharmacist in</p> <p>5 Nassau County failed to exercise good old common sense?</p> <p>6 A. As I answered before, the evidence as to the</p> <p>7 absence of exercising good old-fashioned common sense is</p> <p>8 the scourge of addiction and death due to prescription</p> <p>9 opioids in those counties and in the state of New York</p> <p>10 more broadly.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you understand the pharmacy defendants are</p> <p>12 not involved in the State of New York's case? Or do you</p> <p>13 know that now that I said it?</p> <p>14 A. So the defendants have changed, and so I -- I</p> <p>15 haven't tracked exactly who's in what litigation. I'm</p> <p>16 more broadly aware of the defendants as part of the</p> <p>17 opioid supply chain.</p> <p>18 Q. What aspect of common sense did a Walmart</p> <p>19 pharmacist in Nassau County fail to exercise?</p> <p>20 A. To the extent that there were pill mills in</p> <p>21 Nassau and Suffolk County and a pharmacist filled</p> <p>22 prescriptions for a pill mill doctor without trying to</p> <p>23 make some effort to scrutinize or change the course of</p> <p>24 that prescribing pattern, that pharmacist has</p> <p>25 responsibility.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 providers vis-à-vis the epidemic.</p> <p>2 Q. Any other evidence that those hypotheticals</p> <p>3 actually occurred in Nassau County at a Walmart pharmacy?</p> <p>4 A. I don't have specifics on that, no.</p> <p>5 Q. Same question for any of the pharmacy</p> <p>6 defendants.</p> <p>7 A. Same answer.</p> <p>8 Q. And then same question for Suffolk County for</p> <p>9 all pharmacy defendants.</p> <p>10 A. Same answer.</p> <p>11 Q. You mentioned -- and you've testified about it</p> <p>12 before -- the idea of well-intentioned, well-meaning</p> <p>13 physicians exercising their best medical judgement and</p> <p>14 being duped.</p> <p>15 Do you recall that?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>17 Q. Is it fair to say that if a well-intentioned,</p> <p>18 well-meaning physician who is setting out endeavoring to</p> <p>19 exercise their best medical judgment under the</p> <p>20 circumstances is duped, that there's no reason to think a</p> <p>21 pharmacist would also -- that a pharmacist would not also</p> <p>22 be duped?</p> <p>23 A. Can you rephrase the question?</p> <p>24 Q. Sure.</p> <p>25 If doctors were duped, do you agree that</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 pharmacists were duped?</p> <p>2 A. So I'm not familiar with the types of specific</p> <p>3 continuing medical education that pharmacists receive.</p> <p>4 It's not something that I've looked into or studied. But</p> <p>5 I think it's plausible that if -- if doctors were duped,</p> <p>6 pharmacists were also subject to the same kinds of</p> <p>7 misinformation, but I really haven't studied that.</p> <p>8 Q. Appreciating that you haven't studied the</p> <p>9 continuing education requirements of pharmacists, based</p> <p>10 on your experience as a licensed physician, do you have</p> <p>11 any reason to believe that the substantive medical</p> <p>12 training that a pharmacist receives is more robust than a</p> <p>13 M.D.?</p> <p>14 A. I really wouldn't want to offer an opinion on</p> <p>15 whether or not it's more or less robust. To me, robust</p> <p>16 is a vague term. I'm not really sure what you mean. And</p> <p>17 also, as I said, I'm not familiar with the continuing</p> <p>18 medical education or licensure training that pharmacists</p> <p>19 receive.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you think pharmacists receive more</p> <p>21 substantive medical training than licensed doctors?</p> <p>22 A. I feel like I answered that.</p> <p>23 Q. So you don't know one way or the other?</p> <p>24 A. I don't know.</p> <p>25 Q. So it's possible that pharmacists actually have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 Q. Do you know what percentage of the pharmacy</p> <p>2 market in Nassau County the pharmacy defendants</p> <p>3 represent?</p> <p>4 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>5 Q. Same question for Suffolk.</p> <p>6 A. Same answer.</p> <p>7 Q. Have you conducted any analysis to determine</p> <p>8 which pharmacies in Nassau County were filling too many</p> <p>9 opioid prescriptions?</p> <p>10 A. No, I haven't.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you conducted any analysis to determine</p> <p>12 which pharmacies in Suffolk County were filling too many</p> <p>13 prescriptions?</p> <p>14 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>15 Q. Statewide, have you conducted any analysis to</p> <p>16 determine which pharmacies in New York state were filling</p> <p>17 too many prescriptions?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. In exhibit -- I believe it's C to your report,</p> <p>20 you provide a testimony rate schedule, and I just wanted</p> <p>21 to ask you about your \$800 per hour for trial testimony.</p> <p>22 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>23 Q. When you travel, do you bill for your time as</p> <p>24 well or only expenses?</p> <p>25 A. You mean do I bill for travel time?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 more in depth medical training than licensed physicians?</p> <p>2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: They would have a different type</p> <p>4 of training, but it could be equally in depth.</p> <p>5 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Okay. You also said earlier</p> <p>6 that if someone -- if a pharmacist observed someone</p> <p>7 intoxicated, that should play into the pharmacist's</p> <p>8 decision making in determining whether to dispense.</p> <p>9 Do you recall that?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>11 Q. Any evidence that a pharmacy -- pharmacist at a</p> <p>12 pharmacy defendant in Nassau County dispensed medication</p> <p>13 to an intoxicated patient?</p> <p>14 A. I have no specific knowledge of Nassau County in</p> <p>15 that regard.</p> <p>16 Q. Same question for Suffolk.</p> <p>17 A. Same answer.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you know how many pharmacies are in Nassau</p> <p>19 County?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you know how many are in Suffolk County?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know how many are in the state of New</p> <p>24 York?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 Q. So when you travel to trial in this case, if you</p> <p>2 testify, will you bill for your travel time?</p> <p>3 A. I will bill to be reimbursed for my travel, and</p> <p>4 I will bill for my travel time as well.</p> <p>5 Q. If you hypothetically have to arrive in Long</p> <p>6 Island on a Monday and you don't take the stand until</p> <p>7 Wednesday, would you charge at your hourly rate for your</p> <p>8 time waiting to testify on Monday and Tuesday?</p> <p>9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: No, I would not unless I spent</p> <p>11 some portion of Monday or Tuesday working to prepare for</p> <p>12 the trial.</p> <p>13 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Have you submitted any invoices</p> <p>14 for the New York cases that have not been paid?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Do you know the amount of unpaid pending</p> <p>17 invoices?</p> <p>18 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. You were asked a question earlier</p> <p>20 regarding the percentage of your income from your work</p> <p>21 consulting and testifying in litigation versus your work</p> <p>22 at Stanford. You indicated you could not provide an</p> <p>23 estimate. I want to just follow up.</p> <p>24 Do you know whether your consulting income was</p> <p>25 more or less than 50 percent of your income last year?</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 A. I believe it was less, but it's not something</p> <p>2 that I've actually sat down and added up and calculated.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Switching gears, I want to ask you about</p> <p>4 addiction.</p> <p>5 Do you agree that, at least in theory, all</p> <p>6 addictions can be overcome?</p> <p>7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: So addiction is a disease, and</p> <p>9 just like cancer, some cases of addiction are terminal</p> <p>10 and some are curable or can go into remission for a</p> <p>11 period of time.</p> <p>12 I would say the same is true for addiction.</p> <p>13 It's a chronic, relapsing and remitting disease. Some</p> <p>14 people with one course of treatment can be in remission</p> <p>15 from their addiction for the rest of their lives, and</p> <p>16 that can mean decades.</p> <p>17 Other people, even with aggressive treatment,</p> <p>18 may not be able to achieve remission and may, in fact,</p> <p>19 die of their disease.</p> <p>20 Q. BY MR. CARTER: In your role as someone who</p> <p>21 treats people with substance use disorders, have you ever</p> <p>22 approached a treatment -- a treatment of a particular</p> <p>23 patient and advised them that they would not be able to</p> <p>24 overcome their addiction and the treatment would not</p> <p>25 yield productive results?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 Let me try it this way.</p> <p>2 You are not able to quit on behalf of your</p> <p>3 patients.</p> <p>4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>5 Q. BY MR. CARTER: True?</p> <p>6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: That is true.</p> <p>8 Q. BY MR. CARTER: You've never been able to get a</p> <p>9 patient to quit against their will, absent some kind of</p> <p>10 involuntary commitment setting?</p> <p>11 A. Well, again, it's important to acknowledge that</p> <p>12 the disease of addiction is actually a disease of the</p> <p>13 will on some level. And so when I treat addiction, I'm</p> <p>14 trying to help a patient regain their ability for willful</p> <p>15 choice.</p> <p>16 Q. And to make a quit attempt, in the general</p> <p>17 course, a patient needs sufficient internal motivation</p> <p>18 and external support. Fair?</p> <p>19 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>20 Q. BY MR. CARTER: To make an attempt.</p> <p>21 A. Uh-huh. So I have seen cases of addiction where</p> <p>22 the internal motivation is nonexistent, and yet external</p> <p>23 encouragement can make it possible for that person to</p> <p>24 abstain for a sufficient period of time such that they</p> <p>25 can get their frontal lobe reengaged with their limbic</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: There's always room for hope. You</p> <p>3 know, I would never deprive a patient of hope. Even if I</p> <p>4 worked in a hospice setting where death was eminent,</p> <p>5 there is still room for hope.</p> <p>6 What I certainly would not do is recommend a</p> <p>7 treatment that caused more harm than good, and I would be</p> <p>8 very active in finding the best possible treatment for my</p> <p>9 patient.</p> <p>10 Q. BY MR. CARTER: And it's fair to say that absent</p> <p>11 some kind of involuntary commitment situation, putting</p> <p>12 that aside, it's fair to say that in general, for a</p> <p>13 patient to quit use of a substance, break a cycle of</p> <p>14 addiction and achieve abstinence, that requires an</p> <p>15 intentional act on their part to try and abstain?</p> <p>16 A. So that -- that question -- the answer to that</p> <p>17 question is nuanced because it's very clear that in the</p> <p>18 disease of addiction, some patients lose their capacity</p> <p>19 for voluntary choice, meaning that even when they deeply</p> <p>20 desire to abstain from the substance, they're not able to</p> <p>21 abstain. Hence a residential treatment setting for</p> <p>22 chemical dependency or addiction is an appropriate</p> <p>23 setting for the individual who's lost their capacity for</p> <p>24 voluntary choice.</p> <p>25 Q. And my question was meant to be a simpler one.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 system to be able to make a voluntary choice about their</p> <p>2 consumption of that addictive substance.</p> <p>3 Q. BY MR. CARTER: What is DSM-5?</p> <p>4 A. The Diagnostic and Statistic Manual of</p> <p>5 Disorders, Fifth Edition.</p> <p>6 Q. And how do you use that as a psychiatrist?</p> <p>7 A. I use it with a grain of salt. It is an</p> <p>8 imperfect way to categorize mental illness. It's also to</p> <p>9 some extent a dictionary for communication among</p> <p>10 healthcare providers.</p> <p>11 I do use those criteria to make diagnoses, but I</p> <p>12 also take other considerations into account in forming my</p> <p>13 treatment plan.</p> <p>14 Q. So you have used the criteria, the diagnostic</p> <p>15 criteria and framework for an opioid use disorder as set</p> <p>16 forth in DSM-5; correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, I have used those criteria.</p> <p>18 Q. And the fifth edition was published in 2013;</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. I believe so.</p> <p>21 Q. It followed DSM-4-TR; correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And I believe you testified to this earlier, but</p> <p>24 fair to say that if an opioid use disorder under the</p> <p>25 framework articulated in DSM-5 includes a spectrum of use</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 disorders?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. It ranges from mild, moderate to severe, for</p> <p>4 those that have a use disorder?</p> <p>5 A. That is correct.</p> <p>6 Q. And is it fair to say that as a clinician</p> <p>7 attempting a diagnosis of an opioid use disorder, you</p> <p>8 want to see and you personally would expect a 360-degree</p> <p>9 view of all the circumstances involved in making that</p> <p>10 assessment of a patient?</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Can you define what you mean by</p> <p>13 360-degree view?</p> <p>14 Q. BY MR. CARTER: So if you're approaching in a</p> <p>15 clinical setting a potential diagnosis and you're</p> <p>16 evaluating someone for an opioid use disorder, you want</p> <p>17 to see and evaluate the full context that's available to</p> <p>18 you in that setting?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, I would do that.</p> <p>20 Q. And you would consider all of the medical</p> <p>21 history and data and patient evaluation available to you</p> <p>22 as the clinician; correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, unless there was a piece of evidence that</p> <p>24 was so glaring and obvious that I would not necessarily</p> <p>25 be required to imminently rely on all the other pieces of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 A. I apply my clinical judgment with a healthy dose</p> <p>2 of skepticism around the fact that much of the education</p> <p>3 that I have received has been adulterated by corporate</p> <p>4 interests. And so I really have to do an extra due</p> <p>5 diligence and dig deeper to know what the truth is.</p> <p>6 Q. Now, you testified earlier that data that shows</p> <p>7 a range of 10 to 30 percent as a prevalence of somewhere</p> <p>8 on the spectrum of an opioid use disorder for people</p> <p>9 using opioids for chronic pain; correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. I want to take the other end of that population.</p> <p>12 So I want to use your 30 percent as the best data on the</p> <p>13 high end and say, okay, so the other 70 percent, the</p> <p>14 70 percent that aren't somewhere on the opioid use</p> <p>15 disorder spectrum, is it fair to say that millions of</p> <p>16 Americans have used opioids and not developed an opioid</p> <p>17 use disorder?</p> <p>18 A. That's fair to say, except that you also want to</p> <p>19 take into account the fact that they may be at ongoing</p> <p>20 risk for developing an opioid use disorder, even if they</p> <p>21 haven't developed it yet.</p> <p>22 Furthermore, those individuals not meeting the</p> <p>23 criteria for an opioid use disorder may nonetheless</p> <p>24 suffer severe adverse medical consequences as a result of</p> <p>25 their prolonged opioid therapy.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 information, although I would still want to gather those</p> <p>2 over time. Which is to say I -- I may make a diagnosis</p> <p>3 even absent a 360-degree view if there were -- was a data</p> <p>4 point that made it very obvious.</p> <p>5 Q. Have you ever diagnosed a patient in a clinical</p> <p>6 setting with an opioid use disorder based on aggregate</p> <p>7 statistics in lieu of that patient's individual clinical</p> <p>8 presentation?</p> <p>9 A. To some extent, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. So you have not conducted an analysis of a</p> <p>11 patient, not figured out their substance use history,</p> <p>12 their pattern, and run it through the criteria of DSM-5.</p> <p>13 Instead of that, you've relied on aggregate statistics to</p> <p>14 make a diagnosis.</p> <p>15 Is that --</p> <p>16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: No, that's -- that's not correct.</p> <p>18 I don't rely on aggregate statistics to make that</p> <p>19 diagnosis. But I do allow the reading of the science to</p> <p>20 inform my interpretation of the specific clinical data</p> <p>21 that I gather on a patient.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. CARTER: You apply your clinical judgment</p> <p>23 and medical training which includes all of the</p> <p>24 constellation of factors that you've considered in the</p> <p>25 course of your work and education; correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 So it's essential that we, as healthcare</p> <p>2 providers, do a careful risk-benefit assessment informed</p> <p>3 by the unique patient history, as well as the evidence</p> <p>4 showing that there is no robust or reliable data for</p> <p>5 long-term efficacy of opioids and then enormous risk in</p> <p>6 continuing opioids long-term.</p> <p>7 Q. But to the -- to the basic statistical point,</p> <p>8 you agree that as a matter of arithmetic, there are</p> <p>9 millions of Americans who have taken opioids for chronic</p> <p>10 pain and not developed, to this point in time, some</p> <p>11 version of an opioid use disorder?</p> <p>12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Well, I agree as a matter of</p> <p>14 statistics that there are millions of Americans who have</p> <p>15 not necessarily developed an opioid use disorder, but</p> <p>16 those individuals are still at high risk, and that's the</p> <p>17 point that I'm trying to make.</p> <p>18 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Okay. Do you agree that there</p> <p>19 are millions of Americans who have used opioids for</p> <p>20 chronic pain and not gone on to take any kind of illegal</p> <p>21 drug?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I agree.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you agree that there are millions of</p> <p>24 Americans who have taken opioids for chronic pain and not</p> <p>25 committed any crime related to obtaining substances?</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 MR. CARTER: Okay. I'm going to mark as</p> <p>3 Exhibit 6, a page from DSM-5. This is the one I already</p> <p>4 premarked.</p> <p>5 (Exhibit 6, Opioid Use Disorder, DSM-5, page</p> <p>6 543, marked for identification.)</p> <p>7 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Now, after DSM provides the</p> <p>8 criteria for diagnosis, it also includes statistics and</p> <p>9 commentary about the framework for the various diagnoses</p> <p>10 contained within it; correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And I want to ask you about the highlighted</p> <p>13 language on page 543 under the heading "Prevalence." The</p> <p>14 first sentence: "The 12-month prevalence of opioid use</p> <p>15 disorder is approximately 0.37 percent among adults age</p> <p>16 18 and older in the community population."</p> <p>17 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. I want to read the next sentence.</p> <p>20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Before you do, I just want to</p> <p>21 put an objection to the incomplete document that's being</p> <p>22 provided.</p> <p>23 MR. CARTER: That's fine.</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: And the lack of the references</p> <p>25 that DSM-5 undoubtedly cites elsewhere in the document</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 Q. Is that a "yes"?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, you read that correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Now, when you look at the statistic DSM-5</p> <p>4 quotes, the first one we read, the 0.37 percent that's an</p> <p>5 American statistic, that falls within the 0.36 and 0.44</p> <p>6 numbers that are the average prevalence for the European</p> <p>7 Union and Norway; correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Have you ever written to the American</p> <p>10 Psychiatric Association suggesting revisions or</p> <p>11 corrections to DSM-5?</p> <p>12 A. No, but it's a good idea.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. So do you dispute the numbers -- well,</p> <p>14 let's take each of these in -- in part.</p> <p>15 Do you dispute the 12-month prevalence of opioid</p> <p>16 use disorder of 0.37 percent for Americans age 18 and</p> <p>17 older?</p> <p>18 A. Can I read this document before I answer?</p> <p>19 Q. Sure.</p> <p>20 A. Okay.</p> <p>21 (Interruption in proceedings.)</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes. Thank you.</p> <p>23 Q. BY MR. CARTER: So my question is: Do you</p> <p>24 dispute the number in the first paragraph under</p> <p>25 prevalence reported for 12-month prevalence in America?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 that you have not provided.</p> <p>2 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Okay. You have a copy of DSM-5,</p> <p>3 Doctor; correct?</p> <p>4 A. I do.</p> <p>5 Q. The second sentence --</p> <p>6 A. But not right here with me.</p> <p>7 Q. Yes.</p> <p>8 "This may be an underestimate because of the</p> <p>9 large number of incarcerated individuals with opioid use</p> <p>10 disorders."</p> <p>11 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>12 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>13 Q. All right. Then I want to read from the last</p> <p>14 paragraph in that section that makes a comparison to</p> <p>15 Europe.</p> <p>16 "The 12-month prevalence of problem opioid use</p> <p>17 in European countries in the community population ages 15</p> <p>18 to 64 years is between 0.1 percent and 0.8 percent."</p> <p>19 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>20 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>21 Q. The next sentence reads: "The average</p> <p>22 prevalence of problem opioid use in the European Union</p> <p>23 and Norway is between 0.36 percent and 0.44 percent."</p> <p>24 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>25 A. Uh-huh.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 A. So I would really like to see what they base</p> <p>2 these numbers on. That would be a good place to start.</p> <p>3 And if I could review those, then I would have more to</p> <p>4 say.</p> <p>5 But in general, I -- I believe that reliable</p> <p>6 sources quote about 2 to 4 million Americans have an</p> <p>7 opioid use disorder in this country, with some reports as</p> <p>8 high as 15 million Americans with opioid use disorder</p> <p>9 when you included marginalized populations like</p> <p>10 incarcerated individuals, which was not done for this</p> <p>11 calculation.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>13 A. Yeah.</p> <p>14 Q. You can put that aside.</p> <p>15 A. Okay.</p> <p>16 Q. Have you analyzed the medical examiner overdose</p> <p>17 death data from Nassau County? It's not in your list of</p> <p>18 sources, but...</p> <p>19 A. Yes. It's not in my list of sources, but I did</p> <p>20 review the Keyes reports, which does analyze some</p> <p>21 overdose death data, and I did include on page -- sorry,</p> <p>22 let me find the page.</p> <p>23 Q. I'll withdraw the question and ask you a similar</p> <p>24 one.</p> <p>25 A. Okay.</p>

40 (Pages 154 - 157)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 158</p> <p>1 Q. Do you have an opinion in this case as to the 2 number or the identities of any particular case numbers 3 in Nassau County where a decedent was diagnosed with an 4 opioid use disorder? 5 A. No. 6 Q. Any such opinion for Suffolk County? 7 A. No. 8 Q. Are you able to look at the medical examiner's 9 chart of reported deaths and individually diagnose the 10 subjects referenced there with an opioid use disorder 11 during the course of their life? 12 A. Are you asking me if I have done that or if I 13 would be able to do that? 14 Q. So first question: Have you? 15 A. I have not. 16 Q. And that applies to Suffolk County as well? 17 A. That's correct. 18 Q. Okay. Looking at an autopsy report that lists 19 toxicology at time of death, does that information by 20 itself provide an individual's substance use history? 21 A. It might be indicative, but probably in and of 22 itself not sufficient. 23 Q. Is there a posthumous test for addiction or an 24 opioid use disorder? 25 A. So the diagnosis of addiction, there's no</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 160</p> <p>1 Q. To your knowledge, do any of the doctors that 2 you encountered in the setting you described practice in 3 Nassau County? 4 A. I don't know. 5 Q. Do you know whether any of those doctors 6 practice in Suffolk County? 7 A. I don't know. 8 Q. Okay. Have you interviewed any employee of 9 Nassau County or Suffolk County for purposes of forming 10 your opinions in this case? 11 A. No. 12 Q. Have you interviewed any resident of Nassau 13 County or Suffolk County for purposes of forming your 14 opinions in this case? 15 A. No. 16 Q. Have you interviewed any law enforcement 17 personnel in Nassau County or Suffolk County for purposes 18 of forming your opinions in this case? 19 A. No. 20 Q. Have you interviewed any community pharmacists 21 in Nassau County or Suffolk County for purposes of 22 forming your opinions in this case? 23 A. No. 24 Q. And taking out the qualifier of purposes of 25 forming your opinion, have you ever interviewed a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 159</p> <p>1 biological test for that. There's not a brain scan or 2 blood test. It's the accumulation of multiple sources of 3 evidence based on behaviors, but not just patient 4 self-report, other objective data of their behavior, 5 including potentially a coroner's report indicating what 6 substances were in their system at the time of death. 7 Q. Are you aware of any specific case in Nassau 8 County where an individual only ever used opioids as 9 directed under the care of a physician in the amount 10 directed and yet died of an overdose from that prescribed 11 opioid? 12 A. I'm not aware of cases like that in Suffolk or 13 Nassau counties, but I am aware of cases like that in my 14 own medical experience. 15 Q. Okay. I want to ask you a couple questions 16 about materials you considered. 17 Have you interviewed any doctor practicing in 18 Nassau County for purposes of offering your opinions in 19 this case? 20 A. I haven't interviewed -- I haven't set out to 21 interview doctors specifically for the purposes of this 22 litigation, but I have traveled to New York and talked to 23 doctors who have experiences, and based on those 24 conversations, I have gathered knowledge about the 25 situation in New York.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 161</p> <p>1 community pharmacist in Nassau County or Suffolk County, 2 to your knowledge? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Do you know how the opioid crisis in Nassau 5 County in 2020 compares to the situation in 2015? 6 A. So the opioid epidemic, including in the state 7 of New York, has heavily impacted the foster care system. 8 Q. And just to be clear, I want to just remind you 9 I'm only focused on Nassau County, and then I'll have a 10 separate question for Suffolk. 11 A. Okay. 12 Q. If that can guide your answer, I'd appreciate 13 it. 14 A. Okay. Well, I don't have data specific to 15 Nassau or Suffolk County in my report and in my answer, 16 but I do have for the State of New York. 17 Q. Okay. Since I'm not -- my client's not in the 18 New York case, I'll let others ask you about broader New 19 York data. 20 A. Okay. 21 Q. Switching gears, is it fair to say that the 22 majority of prescriptions for opioids in Nassau and 23 Suffolk County were made in good faith for a legitimate 24 medical purpose? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 162</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I would not want to opine on</p> <p>2 whether it was the majority or the minority of</p> <p>3 prescription opioids that have -- I -- I -- it is both</p> <p>4 the prescriptions made in good faith and prescriptions</p> <p>5 made not in good faith that have contributed to the</p> <p>6 opioid epidemic across this, country including in Suffolk</p> <p>7 and Nassau County, which I do not believe are rare or</p> <p>8 unusual or differ in any substantial way from the rest of</p> <p>9 the United States.</p> <p>10 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Without asking you to give a</p> <p>11 qualitative comparison in terms of majority or minority,</p> <p>12 do you agree that there are -- there were hundreds of</p> <p>13 thousands of prescriptions for opioids in Nassau and</p> <p>14 Suffolk counties that were made in good faith for a</p> <p>15 legitimate medical purpose?</p> <p>16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I would agree that many of the</p> <p>18 prescriptions for opioids that actually led to harm, both</p> <p>19 in individuals to whom they were prescribed as well as</p> <p>20 other individuals who became exposed to opioids through</p> <p>21 the oversupply, were made in good faith by the</p> <p>22 prescribing physician.</p> <p>23 Q. BY MR. CARTER: And there were also</p> <p>24 prescriptions that did not lead to harm that were made in</p> <p>25 good faith by the prescribing physician?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p> <p>1 into believing that opioids are safe and effective</p> <p>2 treatment, when, in fact, they are not safe and effective</p> <p>3 for the purposes of chronic and minor pain conditions.</p> <p>4 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Were such prescriptions, as you</p> <p>5 described them, filled and dispensed by pharmacists</p> <p>6 acting in good faith?</p> <p>7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I would really have to look at the</p> <p>9 specifics of the actions of a given pharmacy and a given</p> <p>10 pharmacist to be able to make that determination.</p> <p>11 Q. BY MR. CARTER: And you have not done that work</p> <p>12 and therefore do not have any such opinion for this case.</p> <p>13 Fair?</p> <p>14 A. Well, I do have an opinion, which I've</p> <p>15 expressed, but I haven't done that specific work on a</p> <p>16 specific pharmacy or a specific pharmacist in those</p> <p>17 counties.</p> <p>18 Q. Sitting here today, can you tell me either a</p> <p>19 number or percentage of prescriptions for opioids that</p> <p>20 the pharmacy defendants in this case should have refused</p> <p>21 to dispense in Nassau County?</p> <p>22 A. I think the way that you framed the question</p> <p>23 simplifies the problem. So it's not just a matter of</p> <p>24 pharmacists refusing to fill a prescription; it's a</p> <p>25 matter of pharmacists doing their due diligence to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 163</p> <p>1 A. I think it's a minority of those prescriptions</p> <p>2 that did not lead, that has not lead, that is not</p> <p>3 continuing to lead to some degree of harm.</p> <p>4 Q. But they do exist?</p> <p>5 A. They do exist in very rare circumstances.</p> <p>6 Q. In this case, do you have an opinion as to any</p> <p>7 specific number of prescriptions for opioids filled in</p> <p>8 the Nassau or Suffolk County that were not for a</p> <p>9 legitimate medical purpose?</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I do not have a specific number.</p> <p>12 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Do you have a specific</p> <p>13 percentage?</p> <p>14 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Percentage wise, I would opine</p> <p>16 that the large majority of prescriptions written for</p> <p>17 opioids in Suffolk and Nassau County were not, in fact,</p> <p>18 written for legitimate medical purposes, but not because</p> <p>19 the physicians were -- were in any way practicing outside</p> <p>20 of what they had been taught. Let me rephrase that.</p> <p>21 The majority of opioid prescriptions written in</p> <p>22 those counties, as sort of broadly representing the</p> <p>23 phenomenon in the United States, have been written for</p> <p>24 what doctors thought was a legitimate purpose, but in</p> <p>25 fact was not a legitimate purpose, that they were duped</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 determine whether or not the risks outweigh the benefits</p> <p>2 for a given prescription. And I think in general, across</p> <p>3 the opioid supply chain, that kind of due diligence has</p> <p>4 been absent.</p> <p>5 Q. Let me reask my question.</p> <p>6 Are you able to opine and provide either a</p> <p>7 specific number or a specific percentage of prescriptions</p> <p>8 for opioids that you believe a pharmacy defendant should</p> <p>9 not have dispensed in Nassau County?</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I'm not able to provide a specific</p> <p>12 number or a specific percentage, but I have a qualifier,</p> <p>13 if that's okay.</p> <p>14 But, again, I do think that it's not as simple</p> <p>15 as refusing to dispense. And a large part of my work,</p> <p>16 especially in the past three to four years, has</p> <p>17 emphasized the need for compassionate tapers. We have</p> <p>18 created several generations of individuals, pain patients</p> <p>19 who are now physiologically dependent on opioids and</p> <p>20 should not be abruptly discontinued.</p> <p>21 So I think an effective intervention here is not</p> <p>22 simply to refuse to dispense, but it's to come together</p> <p>23 and figure out how we can safely and compassionately care</p> <p>24 for several generations of Americans who have suffered</p> <p>25 iatrogenic harm.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p> <p>1 Q. BY MR. CARTER: Sitting here today, are you able 2 to provide an opinion regarding the number or a specific 3 percentage of prescriptions for opioids that a pharmacy 4 defendant should have refused to dispense in Suffolk 5 County? 6 A. Same answer as before. 7 Q. Okay. Have you ever worked with Dr. Judith 8 Prochaska? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Have you spoken to her about your testimony in 11 this case? 12 A. Not at any level of detail. 13 Q. Have you spoken to her about testifying in 14 trials on behalf of plaintiffs? 15 A. I may have mentioned that I've been retained as 16 an expert witness, but not -- not any specifics beyond 17 that. 18 Q. Are you familiar with Dr. Robert Proctor from 19 the history department at Stanford? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Have you ever spoken to him about testifying for 22 plaintiffs in litigation? 23 A. No. 24 Q. Okay. Have you spoken to him about your 25 opinions and work in the area of opioids?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 168</p> <p>1 excluded by a Court from testifying as an expert 2 regarding marketing causation? That is, any effect 3 defendants' marketing efforts may have had on the supply 4 or sales of opioids? 5 A. I do believe in the MDL it was determined that I 6 do not have marketing expertise and so should not opine 7 on direct causation, but I would qualify that by saying 8 that I do have expertise on the extent to which 9 scientific evidence has informed or failed to inform the 10 marketing material of defendants in this case. 11 Q. And have you read the opinion excluding you from 12 offering those opinions? 13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. Vague, "those 14 opinions." 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. So could you -- 16 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Those opinions that I've referred 17 to, that you've agreed that you have been excluded from 18 testifying as an expert about. 19 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 20 Do you have the order? 21 MR. TSAI: (Shakes head.) 22 THE WITNESS: So I guess could you repeat the 23 question? 24 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Yes. 25 Have you read the order that you referred to the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p> <p>1 A. No, I have not. 2 MR. CARTER: Those are all the questions I have, 3 time permitting. I'll just note for the record I do have 4 additional questions, but subject to the Court's 5 limitations, I have to tender the witness at this time. 6 So I just have an objection on that basis. 7 Thank you for your time, Doctor. 8 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record again? 10 MR. CARTER: Yes, please. 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the 12 time is 1:15 p.m. 13 (Recess.) 14 (Mr. Pyser leaves deposition room.) 15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time 16 is 1:23 p.m. 17 EXAMINATION 18 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Good afternoon. 19 A. Good afternoon. 20 Q. Very good to see you again. 21 A. Likewise. 22 Q. One of these days we should chat more about your 23 Chinese language skills. 24 A. Uh-huh. 25 Q. So just diving right in, have you ever been</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 169</p> <p>1 national MDL excluding you from testifying regarding 2 marketing conditions? 3 A. Yes, I have read that order. But I would say 4 that it -- 5 MR. TSAI: You know, I think that we've got a 6 limited time. Let -- the admonition directly from the 7 Court is answer the question. Don't offer additional 8 opinions. So I'd like to move on. 9 Q. Do you have any degrees or training in 10 pharmacoeconomics? 11 A. No. 12 Q. Do you teach any courses on the econometrics of 13 sales or marketing? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Do you have any degrees or training in the 16 econometrics of sales or marketing? 17 A. No. 18 Q. Do you have any degrees or training in marketing 19 statistics? 20 A. No. 21 Q. Do you have any employment experience working in 22 the field of pharmaceutical marketing? 23 A. No. 24 Q. Do you belong to any professional associations 25 in the field of pharmaceutical marketing?</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Have you ever worked for the DA?</p> <p>3 MR. ARBITBLIT: The DA?</p> <p>4 Q. BY MR. TSAI: DEA.</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Have you ever consulted for the DEA?</p> <p>7 A. I have done some unpaid consulting for the DEA.</p> <p>8 Q. Oh. When was that?</p> <p>9 A. That was just last week.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And what was the nature of that</p> <p>11 consulting?</p> <p>12 A. A DEA agent in Oakland who does undercover work</p> <p>13 to try to figure out whether doctors in that area are</p> <p>14 engaging in safe opioid prescribing consulted me about</p> <p>15 what an evidence-based evaluation of a patient should</p> <p>16 look like, and I spent about an hour on the phone with</p> <p>17 him.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. How many conversations did you have with</p> <p>19 that DEA agent in Oakland?</p> <p>20 A. One.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Other than that conversation, have you</p> <p>22 consulted for the DEA?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Have you ever designed a suspicious order</p> <p>25 monitoring program?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 not have a specific sales force for their generics, but</p> <p>2 most of the opioid manufacturers' defendants in this case</p> <p>3 had a combination of branded and generic opioids, and the</p> <p>4 generic -- and the marketing that those defendants did</p> <p>5 for their branded opioids augmented sales and influenced</p> <p>6 sales in prescribing of their generic opioids.</p> <p>7 Q. Are you aware of any -- can you identify any</p> <p>8 defendant maker of generic opioids with a sales force in</p> <p>9 New York?</p> <p>10 A. I don't know specifics on their sales forces in</p> <p>11 New York. I would assume that all of the defendants have</p> <p>12 deployed a sales force in New York state.</p> <p>13 Q. Sorry. I meant with respect to their portfolio</p> <p>14 of generic medicine specifically.</p> <p>15 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Could you rephrase your question?</p> <p>17 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Sure.</p> <p>18 Identify a defendant maker of generics that had</p> <p>19 a sales force for those generic opioids in New York.</p> <p>20 A. I am assuming, although I don't know for sure,</p> <p>21 that all of the defendants had a sales force for opioids</p> <p>22 in the state of New York.</p> <p>23 Q. And by "opioids," you're referring to a sales</p> <p>24 force for their branded products; correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes. But as I said, their marketing for branded</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you hold yourself out as an expert in the</p> <p>3 design or implementation of DEA registrant suspicious</p> <p>4 order monitoring?</p> <p>5 A. I think that I could offer an informed opinion</p> <p>6 on what suspicious orders might look like based on my</p> <p>7 clinical experience and my knowledge of addiction.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you consider that informed opinion to be</p> <p>9 expertise in the -- the design and implementation of a</p> <p>10 DEA registrant's suspicious order monitoring systems?</p> <p>11 A. I think as a front-line clinician working with</p> <p>12 people with opioid addiction and as somebody who has</p> <p>13 researched the opioid epidemic, I could be a useful</p> <p>14 source of knowledge in designing such a system.</p> <p>15 Q. Are you familiar with the concept of sameness in</p> <p>16 the context of sales of generic medicines?</p> <p>17 A. If by "sameness" you mean that drugs are</p> <p>18 pharmacologically similar and act in a similar way. Is</p> <p>19 that what you mean by "sameness"?</p> <p>20 Q. Is that your understanding of what that term</p> <p>21 "sameness" means in the context of generic medicines?</p> <p>22 A. That would be my guess as to what it means.</p> <p>23 Q. Are you aware that makers of generic opioids did</p> <p>24 not have a sales force for those generic medicines?</p> <p>25 A. I am aware that makers of generic opioids did</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 products also impacted the sales of generics.</p> <p>2 Q. You did no regression analysis to isolate the</p> <p>3 impact on sales that any opioid marketing by any</p> <p>4 individual defendant had on New York doctors and nurses;</p> <p>5 is that correct?</p> <p>6 A. I did no personal regression analysis.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. You did not conduct any analysis to</p> <p>8 isolate which individual prescribers in New York</p> <p>9 purportedly relied upon any alleged marketing by any</p> <p>10 individual defendant; correct?</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: On a national scale?</p> <p>13 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Again, answer the question. I</p> <p>14 limited this to New York.</p> <p>15 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I believe that most prescribers in</p> <p>17 New York were the recipients of the misleading</p> <p>18 promotional messages of opioid manufacturers in New York</p> <p>19 state, and I base that on my discussions -- I base that</p> <p>20 in part on my discussions with doctors in the state of</p> <p>21 New York in my travels there.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. TSAI: You know, the directive from the</p> <p>23 Court is you must be direct and not evade, answer the</p> <p>24 question. Otherwise, we'll be back here.</p> <p>25 So I asked you very specifically about New York</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 and about individual prescribers and individual 2 defendants. So let me ask again, and if I could please 3 receive an answer to that question. 4 You did not conduct any analysis to isolate 5 which individual prescribers in New York purportedly 6 relied upon any alleged marketing by any individual 7 defendant; is that correct? 8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form and object to 9 badgering and object to the precursor to the question. 10 THE WITNESS: I did not conduct individual 11 analysis of specific prescribers in the state of New 12 York. 13 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Did you conduct any actual survey 14 specific to New York regarding pharmaceutical marketing 15 that was seen or heard or otherwise communicated to 16 doctors or patients in New York? 17 A. I have had discussions with doctors in the state 18 of New York who have told me that they've been the 19 recipients of the same misleading promotional messages as 20 all the rest of us have for the past three decades and -- 21 and also the statistics on addiction rates and deaths in 22 the state of New York mean that New York is not somehow a 23 exception on a national level in terms of this opioid 24 epidemic. 25 And so that leads me to conclude that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 Q. Have you done any analysis yourself quantifying 2 the contribution in your opinion of that company to the 3 opioid situation in New York? 4 A. I have not quantified the contribution, nor do I 5 think that it's my role to quantify the contribution. 6 Q. Okay. And you have not quantified the 7 contribution, nor do you believe it's your role to 8 quantify the contribution, with respect to any defendant 9 in this case. 10 Is that fair to say? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: Well, I would quantify -- I would 13 quantify the contribution of the defendants in this case 14 by saying that without their actions, I believe the 15 opioid would not have occurred. 16 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So that's a general opinion 17 as to all defendants as a group, fair to say? 18 A. That's correct. 19 Q. So just to be clear, you have not done any 20 analysis yourself quantifying the contribution in your 21 opinion of any specific defendant business to the opioid 22 situation in New York; is that correct? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. You believe that others, let's say outside the 25 circle of what you say is the opioid pharmaceutical</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 prescribers in the state of New York were also duped in 2 terms of their understanding of the evidence base 3 regarding the use of opioids in the treatment of pain. 4 Q. And that wasn't my question. 5 So you conducted no comprehensive survey of 6 doctors and nurses in New York to understand what 7 marketing materials, if any, prescribers in New York 8 received from what individual defendant; is that correct? 9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 10 THE WITNESS: I feel like I answered your 11 question to the best of my ability. 12 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So do you have a survey that you 13 can show us where you surveyed doctors and nurses in New 14 York regarding asking them for, for example, 15 Mallinckrodt, what specific marketing materials did you, 16 Dr. Smith in Nassau, receive from Mallinckrodt? Do you 17 have that to produce? 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 19 THE WITNESS: I don't have a survey at that 20 level of specificity. 21 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. And just to confirm, even 22 though you've deleted Purdue from your report in this 23 case, in your opinion, do you still consider Purdue as a 24 contributor to the opioid situation in New York? 25 A. Yes, I do.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 industry, others bear some responsibility for the opioid 2 epidemic; is that correct? 3 A. That is correct. 4 Q. Okay. Can you show me where in your methodology 5 you quantified the extent to which those other persons 6 and entities bear responsibility for the opioid epidemic 7 in New York? 8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 9 THE WITNESS: I don't specifically quantify the 10 responsibility of those other entities, but I do make it 11 very clear that the opioid pharmaceutical industry, 12 namely, the defendants, took advantage of some of the 13 structural problems inside medicine to leverage their 14 push for an increase in opioid prescribing. 15 And I do also make it clear that although others 16 are responsible, without the actions of the opioid 17 pharmaceutical industry, I do not believe this opioid 18 epidemic would have occurred, whereas those other 19 entities, their actions might still have occurred, and I 20 don't think it would have led to the crisis that we have 21 today. 22 In other words, the actions of defendants have 23 been instrumental. 24 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let me complete this concept. 25 So in your methodology, there is no place you</p>

45 (Pages 174 - 177)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 can point to, for example, where you quantify the extent 2 to which government policies caused or contributed to the 3 opioid epidemic in New York. 4 Is that fair to say? 5 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form, misstates the 6 record. 7 THE WITNESS: I don't specifically quantify, but 8 I do a lot of qualitative analysis and have done 9 qualitative analysis, both in the writing of my book and 10 in forming my opinion. And in my qualitative analysis, I 11 have apportioned responsibility, pivotal responsibility, 12 to the actions of the defendants. 13 Q. BY MR. TSAI: But no portion of your methodology 14 where you can point to where you quantify the degree of 15 responsibility that you would allocate to government 16 policies? 17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 18 THE WITNESS: I don't give it a number, no. 19 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Same question with respect 20 to the extent to which managed care or reimbursement 21 policies caused or contributed to the opioid epidemic in 22 New York. 23 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 24 THE WITNESS: I don't give it a number, no. 25 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Same questions with respect to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. You said many. I just want 2 to be clear. 3 Do you believe that every factor that you have 4 said others bear some responsibility for the opioid 5 epidemic, every contributing factor is attributable to 6 what you call the opioid pharmaceutical industry? 7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: If not attributable, then actively 9 exploited by the defendants to increase the supply of 10 opioids. 11 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let me just make the record and 12 continue. 13 Is there any part of your methodology you can 14 point to where you quantified the extent to which health 15 insurance companies dictated whether and which patient 16 was prescribed opioids and therefore contributed to the 17 opioid epidemic in New York? 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 19 THE WITNESS: So in my report, I do reference an 20 article on page 5 of the "Use of Opioid Agonist Therapy." 21 And this article specifically looks at opioid prescribing 22 among Medicare Part D patients and notes that at that 23 time, Medicare Part D, for example, did not cover 24 prescriptions for -- give me a moment -- methadone 25 maintenance in the treatment of opioid use disorder, and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 quantifying the extent to which formulary coverage had an 2 impact on the opioid epidemic in New York. 3 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 4 THE WITNESS: So again, all of those 5 contributing factors that appear, as you were phrasing 6 the questions, to be separate from the actions of the 7 defendants were actually heavily influenced by the 8 lobbying efforts of the defendants. 9 So it's difficult for me to isolate and quantify 10 the contributing responsibility of those separate 11 factors, when those factors are not, in fact, separate 12 from the actions of the defendants. And I talk about 13 that in my report. 14 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So, again, just to ask the 15 question, I'm asking you to answer it. 16 A. Yeah. 17 Q. You did not isolate the extent to which, in your 18 opinion, formulary coverage was responsible for the 19 opioid epidemic in New York; is that correct? 20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 21 THE WITNESS: So I didn't isolate it because I 22 don't believe it's isolateable. I believe that many of 23 these structural factors inside and outside of medicine 24 were, in fact, influenced by the opioid pharmaceutical 25 industry.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 181</p> <p>1 that although Medicare Part D did cover 2 buprenorphine/naloxone for the treatment of opioid use 3 disorder, the whole message, or one of the major messages 4 of that article was to opine on the fact that what a -- 5 what a third-party payor like Medicare will cover does 6 influence how that medication is prescribed. 7 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So let me switch gears and 8 let me make it a little more interesting. 9 Let me ask you just agree or disagree, in your 10 opinion. 11 So agree or disagree in your opinion with this 12 proposition: Proper assessment of the patient, proper 13 prescribing practices, periodic reevaluation of therapy, 14 and proper dispensing and storage are appropriate 15 measures to help limit abuse of opioid drugs. 16 A. Yes, those are appropriate measures, but 17 probably not in and of themselves sufficient. 18 Q. Same question. Agree or disagree in your 19 opinion with this proposition: Concerns about abuse, 20 addiction and diversion should not prevent the proper 21 management of pain? 22 A. Implied in your question is that the proper 23 management of pain involves prescribing opioids, and I 24 would say, especially when it comes to chronic pain, that 25 is not true, and that the proper management of chronic</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 182</p> <p>1 pain would be expressly to avoid the prescribing of 2 opioids in the vast majority of cases. Because the 3 evidence is very convincing that opioids used long-term 4 don't work and may even make the pain worse. 5 Q. Okay. Just to clarify, let's talk about the 6 specific context of prescribing an opioid for someone who 7 is showing long-term pain, telling her doctor she has 8 long-term pain. 9 In your opinion, would saying to a doctor, 10 "Concerns about abuse, addiction and diversion should not 11 prevent the proper management of pain," is that 12 misleading, in your opinion? 13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, that is misleading in my 15 opinion, yeah. 16 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Agree or disagree in your 17 opinion with this proposition: The potential for these 18 risks of opioid addiction, abuse or misuse should not 19 prevent the prescribing of opioids for the proper 20 management of pain in any given patient? 21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 22 THE WITNESS: I would really need you to qualify 23 your question regarding more specifically the nature of 24 the pain condition, the prognosis of the individual, 25 whether opioids were being recommended for short or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 184</p> <p>1 health. As well as -- as well as be able to form 2 judgment for how to prescribe the opioid based on true 3 and reliable scientific evidence. 4 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let me just read that 5 proposition again. 6 The potential for these risks of opioid 7 addiction use or misuse should not prevent the 8 prescribing of opioids for the proper management of pain 9 in any given patient. 10 Do you think that that's an accurate statement? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: Could you do me a favor? Because 13 I want to make sure I accurately understand your 14 question. Could you just say the proposition -- 15 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Uh-huh, yes. 16 A. That you want me to -- 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. Okay. Thank you. 19 Q. The potential for these risks of opioid abuse, 20 addiction and misuse should not prevent the prescribing 21 of opioids for the proper management of pain in any given 22 patient? 23 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 24 THE WITNESS: I disagree with that. 25 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. If it were up to you, would</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 183</p> <p>1 long-term use. 2 But to more broadly respond, I do think that the 3 risk of opioid addiction and misuse should be front and 4 center in that healthcare provider's thoughts when 5 considering an opioid prescription. 6 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So is it fair to say -- this is my 7 understanding of your response, is that it depends on the 8 clinical context, things like the nature of the 9 condition, the prognosis of the specific patient, the 10 type of opioid, whether it's short-term, long-term, to -- 11 to opine whether that statement that I just -- that 12 proposition that we just discussed, stating that to 13 doctors would be improper? 14 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 15 THE WITNESS: So the list of topics that you 16 listed are certainly important in the consideration of 17 prescribing opioids, but are not in and of themselves 18 sufficient. 19 The prescriber must also take into account the 20 broader context of the problems of abuse and diversion, 21 especially now in the United States, given the scourge of 22 addiction and death, the opioid epidemic. 23 So it's not just the individual care of that 24 patient, although very, very important. We also have to 25 take into account the Public Health and population level</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 185</p> <p>1 you recommend that prescription opioid medications be 2 taken off the market? 3 A. Of course not. 4 Q. Okay. Would you ban prescription opioids for 5 all pain conditions? 6 A. Of course not. 7 Q. Would you ban the prescription of opioid 8 medications for all pain conditions involving non-cancer 9 pain? 10 A. Of course not. 11 Q. Okay. Would you recommend banning opioid 12 medications for the treatment of conditions involving 13 chronic non-cancer pain? 14 A. Of course not. 15 Q. Okay. So again, agree or disagree with this 16 proposition: There are some people for whom chronic 17 opioids for pain work? 18 A. I would say the scenario in which chronic 19 opioids for chronic pain are more helpful than harmful is 20 a very rare scenario, and in my professional experience, 21 I have seen more harm than good come from chronic opioid 22 therapy, plus the evidence does not support the use of 23 opioids in the treatment of chronic pain. All reliable 24 studies show that opioids are no better than Tylenol or 25 Ibuprofen, with many more incurred risks, and that the</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 186</p> <p>1 risk of addiction and overdose death increases with 2 increasing dose and duration of the opioid therapy. 3 Q. All right. This sounds a lot like commenting on 4 something I didn't ask. 5 Let me ask you very quickly again, do you 6 personally believe that there are people in the United 7 States and New York for whom chronic opioids work, for 8 which the benefit outweighs the harm? 9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection. And since counsel is 10 insisting on putting his preface before the question, 11 which is inappropriate, I'll put mine in, which is that 12 you've answered the question. If you have anything to 13 add, you're free to do so. 14 THE WITNESS: I do think I answered the 15 question. 16 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So is it a "yes," there are people 17 for whom chronic opioids work? 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 19 THE WITNESS: I am willing to consider the 20 possibility that there is a very small group of 21 individuals for whom the benefit of long-term opioids may 22 be slightly better than placebo. But as time goes on, I 23 think the incurred risks for the vast majority of 24 individuals will outweigh any small, incremental benefit. 25 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Along this line, here's a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 188</p> <p>1 Q. BY MR. TSAI: I said evidence, just any 2 evidence. 3 MR. ARBITBLIT: Counsel, don't interrupt her 4 when she's answering. Just Calm down and don't interrupt 5 her when she's answering. You can comment when she's 6 done. 7 MR. TSAI: I just wanted to clarify. 8 MR. ARBITBLIT: You didn't want to clarify. You 9 interrupted her. 10 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Since you interjected, I actually 11 intentionally framed it broadly so I just want to point 12 that out. 13 In your opinion, is there any evidence to 14 support the use of opioids for some people presenting 15 with chronic non-cancer pain? 16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 17 THE WITNESS: I think there is some evidence 18 that there is a very small benefit in some people with 19 the use of opioids long-term, but most of the time that 20 benefit does not meet a clinically meaningful threshold. 21 I talk about in my report, Busse does a 22 metaanalysis looking at the efficacy of opioids long-term 23 in the treatment of pain and finds that there is -- when 24 all of that data is put together, no clinically 25 meaningful difference for those individuals compared to a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 187</p> <p>1 slightly different question. 2 Do you agree or disagree in your opinion: The 3 benefit of short-term opioid therapy is supported by 4 multiple clinical trials? 5 A. So there are reliable trials showing opioids as 6 effective in treatment very short term for acute pain. 7 But there are also studies showing that even acute 8 exposure can lead to significant harm. 9 For example, in my report, I cite a study by 10 Shroeder, et al., showing that a single exposure to 11 opioids through a prescription from a dentist for young 12 people between the ages of 16 and 25, that approximately 13 6 percent of those individuals will go on to be diagnosed 14 with an opioid use disorder within that year. 15 My point only being, to be able to answer your 16 question completely, is that it's not as if the 17 short-term use of opioids is an entirely benign and 18 non-risky scenario. 19 Q. Let's talk about evidence. So do you -- in your 20 opinion, is there enough evidence to support the use of 21 opioids for some people presenting with chronic 22 non-cancer pain? 23 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 24 THE WITNESS: No, there's -- there's not 25 reliable evidence to --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 placebo and the risks incurred are obvious and great and 2 dose-dependent, increasing with dose duration. 3 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So we've heard the term "evidence 4 base," and I just want to see if we can clarify that for 5 our jury. So let's give an example. 6 What if it works, opioid therapy works for 7 Mrs. Smith on Long Island, and she's been taking it for 8 several years, and it's proven to work in her case. 9 In your opinion, would that be an evidence-based 10 case that chronic opioid therapy works for Mrs. Smith? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: So that's a really loaded question 13 because whether or not an opioid is working really 14 depends on who you ask. And if you ask patients 15 themselves, they will often endorse that it is working, 16 when family members will report they're not getting out 17 of bed, they're not engaging in family life, they 18 complain that their pain is worse than ever. 19 So that -- I think therein lies the complexity 20 of this, that to rely on a patient's subjective account 21 alone is insufficient and often wildly inaccurate. 22 And I think the pain community in the United 23 States has widely acknowledged that subject -- subjective 24 reports of levels of pain is insufficient to assess the 25 efficacy of opioids in the treatment of chronic pain.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 190</p> <p>1 The entire field of pain in the United States</p> <p>2 has moved toward, for example, including function as well</p> <p>3 as reports of pain relief in that assessment.</p> <p>4 The Kaiser Washington Post Family Foundation</p> <p>5 survey study cites that if you ask patients themselves</p> <p>6 with chronic pain, who are on long-term opioid therapy,</p> <p>7 whether or not they may be developing an addiction to</p> <p>8 that opioid, 30 percent will endorse that they're worried</p> <p>9 about that. But when you ask their immediate family</p> <p>10 members, 50 percent of their family members will endorse</p> <p>11 that they're worried about that.</p> <p>12 So there's this important gap between the</p> <p>13 subjective experience of improvement and actual</p> <p>14 improvement, and that is because opioids don't just work</p> <p>15 on the new opioid receptor, they also work on the brain's</p> <p>16 reward pathway. So they're reinforcing for reasons that</p> <p>17 have nothing to do with pain.</p> <p>18 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So I'm curious just to test</p> <p>19 that. The followup question, of course, is: What if not</p> <p>20 only Mrs. Smith herself, but also Dr. Jones, her doctor,</p> <p>21 and her family members observed that the chronic opioid</p> <p>22 therapy reduces her pain and does not have significant</p> <p>23 side effects.</p> <p>24 In your opinion, would you advise discontinuing</p> <p>25 that course of therapy?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 192</p> <p>1 So that includes prescribers, that includes</p> <p>2 pharmacists, that includes pharmacies, that includes</p> <p>3 distributors, that includes opioid manufacturers.</p> <p>4 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Includes the patients themselves?</p> <p>5 A. It includes patients themselves.</p> <p>6 Q. It includes family members of patients?</p> <p>7 A. Although -- although I would say that patients</p> <p>8 themselves come to us vulnerable and seeking help, and we</p> <p>9 have a responsibility toward patients in pain, who are</p> <p>10 incredibly vulnerable in that circumstance.</p> <p>11 They rely on us to care for them, and that is</p> <p>12 our responsibility. It is not their responsibility to</p> <p>13 figure out whether or not they've gotten addicted to an</p> <p>14 opioid.</p> <p>15 Q. So I just want to be clear. So in your opinion,</p> <p>16 so let's say for Ms. Smith as an example. Is it your</p> <p>17 opinion that my client, Mallinckrodt, or another</p> <p>18 defendant should be responsible for monitoring the signs</p> <p>19 and symptoms of her post-prescription condition?</p> <p>20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: On some level, yes.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. TSAI: What level?</p> <p>23 A. Well, if you are getting reports, if -- if your</p> <p>24 client is getting reports that individuals are being</p> <p>25 harmed by opioids, becoming dependent, getting started</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 191</p> <p>1 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. Incomplete</p> <p>2 hypothetical.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I think there are rare instances</p> <p>4 in which chronic opioid therapy for chronic pain may, in</p> <p>5 fact, provide some small benefit. But I would argue that</p> <p>6 even in that context, intense vigilance and monitoring is</p> <p>7 required and a constant reassessment of the risks,</p> <p>8 benefits and alternatives. Because at any point, that</p> <p>9 could turn south, and what was previously beneficial may</p> <p>10 not be.</p> <p>11 But I also want to add to that, that the current</p> <p>12 standard of care and monitoring procedures are not in</p> <p>13 existence in this country right now, largely because of</p> <p>14 the actions of defendants that persuaded prescribers that</p> <p>15 they didn't really need to monitor because opioids were</p> <p>16 so safe and patients wouldn't get addicted and there are</p> <p>17 not problems and they work great and you can go as high</p> <p>18 as you want.</p> <p>19 Q. So that intense vigilance and monitoring post</p> <p>20 prescription that you advise, who does that?</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: That vigilance and monitoring, we</p> <p>23 are all responsible for performing a level of vigilance</p> <p>24 and monitoring which is within our professional scope and</p> <p>25 domain.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 193</p> <p>1 and not being able to get off, engaging in obviously</p> <p>2 addictive behavior, you have a responsibility to the</p> <p>3 Public Health to do something about that.</p> <p>4 Or if you are aware that the distributors that</p> <p>5 ship your pills to small communities are, in fact,</p> <p>6 distributing large volumes to tiny little towns that</p> <p>7 could never possibly need that many pills in a billion</p> <p>8 years, it's your responsibility to go to your distributor</p> <p>9 colleagues and say, you know, what's going on here.</p> <p>10 Q. So a couple more questions about propositions I</p> <p>11 just want to get your opinion on.</p> <p>12 What about this proposition: Abuse of opioids</p> <p>13 can occur in the absence of true addiction and is</p> <p>14 characterized by misuse for nonmedical purposes, often in</p> <p>15 combination with other psychoactive substances?</p> <p>16 A. I'm sorry, it's not coming up on the screen the</p> <p>17 way you said it.</p> <p>18 Q. I'll read the proposition again. And just tell</p> <p>19 me if you agree or disagree in your opinion.</p> <p>20 Abuse of opioids can occur in the absence of</p> <p>21 true addiction and is characterized by misuse for</p> <p>22 nonmedical purposes, often in combination with other</p> <p>23 psychoactive substances.</p> <p>24 A. I agree with that proposition.</p> <p>25 Q. Yeah. What about this one: Abuse and addiction</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 194</p> <p>1 are separate and distinct from physical dependence and 2 tolerance?</p> <p>3 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I believe that the distinction 5 that has been made between opioid addiction and opioid 6 dependence is primarily one of convenience for defendants 7 in this case, who tried to push the use of opioids to 8 doctors and their patients by claiming that dependence in 9 and of itself is a non-risky, non-harmful condition.</p> <p>10 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let me go back to that way I 11 stated it.</p> <p>12 Abuse and addiction are separate and distinct 13 from physical dependence and tolerance. In your opinion, 14 would stating that to doctors be improper?</p> <p>15 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I think that the division between 17 dependence and addiction that was made with the DSM-5 and 18 that is commonly taught is primarily an artificial 19 distinction to account for our iatrogenic crisis, and 20 that, in fact, the overlap between addiction and 21 dependence and the changes that occur in the brain in 22 those two conditions are characterized by significant 23 homology or similarity.</p> <p>24 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So you think it's 25 artificial, but do you think it's misleading or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 196</p> <p>1 stems from the fact that people exposed to opioids 2 long-term develop tolerance and so invariably need a 3 higher dose to get the same effect.</p> <p>4 So I believe that the intrinsic limit has to do 5 with the damage incurred by going to higher doses.</p> <p>6 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So that concept that I 7 stated, in your opinion, would stating that to doctors be 8 improper?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. So you talked about you're not licensed 11 to practice medicine in New York, but I just wanted to 12 kind of ask the followup question: Have you ever treated 13 any person in New York? And when I say "New York," I'm 14 talking about the state and the particular counties at 15 issue in this case.</p> <p>16 Have you ever treated any person in New York for 17 any medical condition related to opioids?</p> <p>18 A. I sometimes have patients who see me in 19 consultation in California who come from other states. I 20 can't be -- I can't recall one having come from New York.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And so just to be clear, throughout your 22 career, since you've been licensed in, I think 1995, 23 you've practiced in the state of California?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Is your opinion in this case based on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 195</p> <p>1 inaccurate?</p> <p>2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I think the promotional messages, 4 the teaching messages, the marketing messages of 5 defendants in this case have been extremely misleading 6 around dependence as a separate, distinct, and in their 7 opining, non-harmful condition. Yes, I think that's been 8 a very misleading and artificial construct.</p> <p>9 But now that we're there, now that we have tens 10 of millions of people who are dependent but not 11 necessarily meeting criteria for addiction because the 12 DSM-5 criteria made it very hard to diagnose addiction, 13 raising that bar, now we owe it to individuals to also 14 make this artificial distinction, to classify people as 15 either meeting DSM-5 criteria for addiction or meeting 16 dependence in isolation.</p> <p>17 But phenomenologically, what's happening in the 18 brain is probably very similar.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Last one, I think.</p> <p>20 Agree or disagree with this proposition: There 21 is no intrinsic limit to the analgesic effect of 22 hydromorphone.</p> <p>23 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>24 MR. TSAI: I can spell it for you later.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: This concept of no limit really</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 197</p> <p>1 evaluating the individual case of any specific person in 2 New York with an opioid addiction or overdose?</p> <p>3 A. I don't believe so, no.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So in forming your opinion in this case, 5 you did not review any individual medical record 6 identifying any specific person in New York with an 7 opioid addiction or overdose; is that correct?</p> <p>8 A. That is correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. So, again, this is educating the jury. A 10 medical record for a patient typically contains a section 11 for that individual patient's medical history, for 12 example; is that correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. So, for example, a patient's medical 15 record would have the information as to whether that 16 person had something like a previous diagnosis of a 17 substance use disorder or addiction; is that right?</p> <p>18 A. It is well-known that the listing in the medical 19 record of diagnoses of addiction, including opioid use 20 disorder, undercount the actual cases. And the reasons 21 for that are complicated, having to do with the lack of 22 training in medical school and residency on how to 23 diagnose addiction, as well as the enormous stigma 24 associated with those diagnoses, making prescribers 25 reluctant to put it in the medical record, even when they</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p> <p>1 know that the diagnosis is present. As well as patients 2 themselves being very reluctant to have that diagnosis in 3 the medical record, even in cases when they're getting 4 active treatment for opioid use disorder. 5 So -- so my point -- and this is, I think, an 6 important one to answer your question as best I can -- is 7 that when it comes to opioid misuse, overuse, and 8 addictive use, the medical record is more often than not 9 woefully incomplete. 10 Q. So other components of a medical record would be 11 that doctors are trained to elicit, ask for, patients are 12 asked for input, provide, include family medical history; 13 correct? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Include medication history; correct? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Include treatment and diagnosis history; 18 correct? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Include review of systems; correct? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. And what does "review of systems" mean? 23 A. Review of systems is where you go through all 24 the major organ systems to see if a patient is having a 25 problem in another major organ system that may not be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p> <p>1 training and then I was in my residency. So I prescribed 2 whatever -- whatever other people were prescribing, but 3 certainly plenty of hydrocodone, oxycodone and fentanyl 4 products. 5 Q. Okay. Do you have any basis to kind of not 6 think that you prescribed -- let me just ask it direct. 7 Did you prescribe short-acting opioids? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Did you prescribe long-acting opioids? 10 A. Probably. 11 Q. Did you prescribe both branded and generic 12 opioids? 13 A. Probably. 14 Q. Sitting here today, what is your best 15 recollection of the highest dose of an opioid that you 16 prescribed one of your patients? 17 A. I don't have a recollection of the highest dose 18 that I prescribed. I can tell you some of the highest 19 doses that I've seen in my patient population that others 20 are prescribing, but I don't have a recollection. 21 Q. I just wondered if you remembered. What 22 about -- I mean, you've estimated the number of patients 23 you've seen. Can you estimate the number of times you 24 have prescribed an opioid to one of your patients? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p> <p>1 directly relevant to the reason they are presenting in 2 your clinic, but is certainly relevant to their overall 3 medical treatment. 4 Q. Okay. So last time we talked, you had said, you 5 know, you'd been in practice since 1995, and I think you 6 had estimated you've seen approximately 40,000 patients 7 over the course of your career. 8 A. (Nods head.) 9 Q. I just want to ask: Do you have any update to 10 that? 11 A. No. 12 Q. That remains your estimate of the number of 13 patients that you've seen in your career? 14 A. Yeah. 15 Q. And over the course of your career, you have 16 prescribed many different kinds of opioids, dating back 17 to 1995; correct? 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 Q. BY MR. TSAI: All right. And you've actually 21 prescribed nearly every kind of opioid; is that correct, 22 to your patients? 23 A. I don't have a distinct memory, because it was 24 more than 20 years ago now, of what opioids I prescribed. 25 But I prescribed -- I was very junior. I was in my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 201</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I really can't, and I continue to 2 prescribe opioids now, although just buprenorphine in the 3 treatment of opioid use disorder. 4 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Well, is it safe to say 5 that since you've treated on the order of 40,000 6 patients, that the number of times you've prescribed an 7 opioid to one of your patients is in the thousands? 8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 9 THE WITNESS: I think that's probably fair. 10 Q. BY MR. TSAI: And to the best of your 11 recollection, did you ever prescribe opioids to your 12 patients in combination with other drugs, in situations 13 where they were taking other drugs? 14 A. On the inpatient setting, there's hardly a 15 patient who's just on one drug, so yes. 16 Q. I'd like those agree or disagree. So I'm going 17 to go back to some more, but it's a different topic. 18 So agree or disagree in your opinion: In terms 19 of the treatment of pain, using pain medicine, each 20 individual's medication regimen should be personalized? 21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 22 THE WITNESS: So, to me, that is a broad, 23 sweeping question that I would be reluctant to agree or 24 disagree on without specifics. 25 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So that affirmative statement "in</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 202</p> <p>1 the treatment of pain using pain medication, each 2 individual's medication regimen should be personalized," 3 you're not -- you're not comfortable agreeing with that? 4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 5 THE WITNESS: I -- I agree that medical 6 treatment should be personalized, but also needs to be 7 considered in the broader context of a Public Health 8 crisis. 9 Q. BY MR. TSAI: And in designing a medication 10 régime, personalizing it for a patient, whose -- who does 11 that? 12 MR ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 13 THE WITNESS: Well, that's a great question 14 because in the past 30 years, it's mainly been your 15 client who has designed that. The work of the defendants 16 has been such a force in the way that pain is treated, 17 from the Joint Commission to the Federation of the State 18 Medical Boards to CME, that that protocol is largely the 19 invention of defendants in this case. 20 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Here's another statement. Agree 21 or disagree, in your opinion: Opioids vary greatly in 22 their pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic profiles, which 23 in turn are influenced by route of administration and 24 individual tolerability. 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 204</p> <p>1 medical profession. We need much more robust training, 2 and we need many more resources to create the kind of 3 medical infrastructure to make sure that safe prescribing 4 is happening and that benefits actually are outweighing 5 the risks and helping people who have become physically 6 dependent get off. 7 Q. Right. And so putting aside your view of the 8 state of medical training in the United States, in terms 9 of roles, do you agree that it is the role of the 10 prescribing physician to weigh the risks and benefits of 11 any pain medication when treating their individual 12 patient? 13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 14 THE WITNESS: Healthcare providers, physicians, 15 nurse practitioners, other healthcare providers are not 16 working in a vacuum. They have enormous pressures on 17 them to practice according to protocols and algorithms 18 implemented by a healthcare facility. There are other 19 pressures that I've talked about in terms of patient 20 satisfaction surveys, et cetera. 21 So, yes, a physician needs to exercise his or 22 her best judgment, but that judgment needs to be informed 23 by the evidence, and it must be taken into account that 24 there are other pressures on physicians when it comes to 25 which medicine they choose to prescribe.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 203</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Opioids are similar and different 2 in many ways. So there is variation between opioids in 3 the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, depending upon 4 the route of delivery. But there are universal themes 5 for all opioids, including the way that they bind and 6 stimulate the opioid receptor, as well as the way that 7 they're rewarding in the dopamine reward pathway, 8 contributing to their addictive potential. 9 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. But ultimately, how about 10 this statement: Comparing dosages across opioids and 11 individuals is challenging. 12 A. Yes, I agree. 13 Q. Okay. How about this one: Physicians should 14 individualize therapy based on a review of the patient's 15 potential risks, benefits, side effects and functional 16 assessments and monitor ongoing therapy accordingly. 17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 18 THE WITNESS: I would qualify that by saying 19 that statement is true, but only when informed by a good 20 understanding of the evidence. 21 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. 22 A. For the benefit and risk of opioids. And only 23 when that monitoring is done at an appropriate level of 24 vigilance to really be able to detect the harm. 25 And right now, we're not there in terms of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 205</p> <p>1 So it's not always in their autonomous control. 2 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Do you agree with this 3 statement: Without more -- without detailed data 4 describing the clinical context, in particular the 5 severity of pain, it's difficult to accurately determine 6 medical appropriateness with respect to a prescription 7 for any given patient? 8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 9 THE WITNESS: I disagree with that statement. 10 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Well, can we agree that 11 physicians in New York appropriately prescribed opioids 12 in at least some circumstances? 13 A. That's a big blanket statement that I would be 14 reluctant to agree to. 15 Q. Is it your opinion that all doctors throughout 16 the state of New York who wrote prescriptions for opioid 17 medicines for their patients did so inappropriately? 18 A. The vast majority, yes. 19 Q. Okay. The vast majority is different from all. 20 A. Uh-huh. 21 Q. Can you quantify it? 22 A. There may be some rare instances in which opioid 23 prescribing was appropriate, but in the vast majority, I 24 and my medical colleagues across the country, including 25 the state of New York, have been describing opioids at</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 206</p> <p>1 way too high doses for way too long.</p> <p>2 Q. Well, we're going to be spending a lot of time</p> <p>3 at trial, including the jury. So can you put a number on</p> <p>4 that?</p> <p>5 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>6 Q. BY MR. TSAI: What, in your opinion, the</p> <p>7 percentage of prescriptions by doctors in New York to</p> <p>8 their patients that, in your opinion, were medically</p> <p>9 inappropriate?</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I have seen in my clinical</p> <p>12 experience no cases of opioids at high doses for long</p> <p>13 duration in which the benefits outweighed the risks, and</p> <p>14 I've seen a lot of patients in my career.</p> <p>15 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Yeah. So your answer, I just</p> <p>16 heard, is your practice, and that's in California. This</p> <p>17 case is in New York.</p> <p>18 So just to be clear: Is your opinion in this</p> <p>19 case based on reviewing any document enabling you to</p> <p>20 identify a single actual doctor who prescribed a single</p> <p>21 actual opioid pill to a single actual individual in</p> <p>22 New York?</p> <p>23 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. Objection to</p> <p>24 the prologue.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I am aware of lay press reports of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 208</p> <p>1 unnecessary or inappropriate?</p> <p>2 A. My opinion is not based on specific</p> <p>3 prescriptions. It's based on aggregate prescriptions.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Have you, in your practice, prescribed</p> <p>5 any medically inappropriate prescriptions of opioids to</p> <p>6 any of your patients?</p> <p>7 A. Can you define "medically inappropriate"?</p> <p>8 Q. I'd like to hear your definition.</p> <p>9 A. Well, I think there are a couple ways to think</p> <p>10 about how to define that. Medically inappropriate might</p> <p>11 be a scenario in which I know it's not the right</p> <p>12 prescription for my patient and I prescribe it anyway.</p> <p>13 And I have never engaged in that kind of practice.</p> <p>14 But another form of medical inappropriateness is</p> <p>15 where I believe that it's the appropriate prevention, but</p> <p>16 I'm wrong. But based on my belief, I prescribe the</p> <p>17 prescription -- I prescribe that medication for my</p> <p>18 patient. I have engaged in that kind of error in my --</p> <p>19 in my career, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So taking that definition, using that one.</p> <p>21 A. The latter one?</p> <p>22 Q. The latter one, yes. How many times have you</p> <p>23 prescribed a medically inappropriate prescription of an</p> <p>24 opioid to your patients?</p> <p>25 A. Well, as I testified previously, in the late</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 207</p> <p>1 single individual doctors who prescribed single actual</p> <p>2 opioid pills to single actual individuals in New York,</p> <p>3 who were engaging in egregious overprescribing.</p> <p>4 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So these are reports in the</p> <p>5 newspaper about pill mill doctors in New York?</p> <p>6 A. That's right.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Other than that, can you give -- identify</p> <p>8 any doctor who prescribed opioid medications to any</p> <p>9 individuals in New York?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Did you, in forming your opinion, ask for</p> <p>12 information from the New York counties or from the New</p> <p>13 York State regarding prescriptions that they determined</p> <p>14 were medically improper?</p> <p>15 A. Well, I have reviewed data on New York</p> <p>16 prescribing, and it is here in my report. I refer you to</p> <p>17 page --</p> <p>18 Q. Yeah, I think I know what you're -- it's the</p> <p>19 Nassau County data prescribing data that you referenced.</p> <p>20 A. That's correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So my question was a bit different.</p> <p>22 So just let me ask this: Is your opinion in</p> <p>23 this case based on identifying concrete examples of</p> <p>24 specific prescriptions of any opioids written in New York</p> <p>25 that you believe, in your opinion, were medically</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 209</p> <p>1 1990s -- well, throughout the 1990s in my medical school</p> <p>2 and residency training, I was engaging in inappropriate</p> <p>3 opioid prescribing on a regular if not daily basis.</p> <p>4 Because I was prescribing in a way that was informed by</p> <p>5 the misleading promotional messages of defendants, and</p> <p>6 the entire healthcare system at that point was hijacked</p> <p>7 by Pharma.</p> <p>8 Once I became a psychiatrist, opioid prescribing</p> <p>9 was out of my scope of practice, although pain treatment</p> <p>10 was not. And then as I became more knowledgeable and</p> <p>11 more invested in helping patients who had become</p> <p>12 dependent or addicted to opioids, patients struggling</p> <p>13 with chronic pain, and I began to research this area, I</p> <p>14 got a courtesy faculty appointment in Stanford Department</p> <p>15 of Pain Medicine, began to see patients in their clinics,</p> <p>16 and then got the x-waiver certification to prescribe</p> <p>17 buprenorphine for opioid addiction, then I resumed opioid</p> <p>18 prescribing.</p> <p>19 And in that context, I have made errors in</p> <p>20 opioid prescribing, but I like to think those errors have</p> <p>21 been few.</p> <p>22 Q. Umm --</p> <p>23 A. So well-intentioned errors, prescribing. An</p> <p>24 example might be thinking that a patient could steward a</p> <p>25 seven-day supply of buprenorphine and discovering by</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 210</p> <p>1 urine drug screen or prescription drug monitoring 2 database seven days later that no, in fact, they could 3 not. 4 Q. Okay. So let's talk about that example. So 5 that's an example of diversion; right? 6 A. Not necessarily. So diversion means that -- as 7 you know -- just clarifying for the jury -- that the 8 pills make it to someone other than for whom they were 9 intended. But a very common problem that can arise is 10 that patients misuse their own opioid prescription. 11 So most of the time in my clinical population, 12 it's their personal misuse of the prescription rather 13 than diversion, per se. 14 Because I can tell you most patients don't admit 15 to diversion unless it's been years in the past. I 16 have -- I have had patients tell me about their diversion 17 activities, but usually not when they're under my care 18 and not with my prescription. They don't do that. 19 They'll in -- in the process of recovery, talk 20 about prescriptions they received from another provider 21 in the past and diverted, which has been a good education 22 for me about diversion. 23 Q. Well, can we agree that not every single opioid 24 medicine that one of the defendants made was diverted to 25 an illegal use?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 212</p> <p>1 properly using what you had prescribed; is that -- 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Okay. So in -- and can you give a number as to 4 how many suspicious cases you -- over the course of your 5 career, that you've encountered in this way? 6 A. I really can't give a number based on my 7 personal experience. I don't tend to count like that, 8 and I wouldn't want to give you a number that was 9 inaccurate. 10 Q. Well, could we say more than ten? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: More than ten individual cases of 13 diversion? 14 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Where you suspected diversion in 15 your patients? 16 A. We could probably say more than ten, yes. 17 Q. More than a hundred? 18 A. No, I wouldn't say more than a hundred. 19 Q. Okay. So when you had -- you suspected 20 diversion, how did you -- tell me how you acted to 21 counteract that suspicion, to counteract what you believe 22 was diversion? 23 A. So I also want to qualify my prior statement 24 regarding your attempts to quantify my patient experience 25 around diversion.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 211</p> <p>1 A. Yes, we can agree. 2 Q. Can we agree that not every single opioid 3 medicine that the defendant businesses made caused 4 someone to become addicted? 5 A. Yes, we can agree to that. 6 Q. Okay. So you talked previously about examples, 7 instances in your practice where you realized that your 8 patients were giving away the opioid that you had 9 prescribed them to, you know, third parties, like 10 friends, family, to whom you did not prescribe the 11 opioid; is that right? 12 A. Well, I want to qualify that answer. I think I 13 would sharpen the accuracy of my response on that to 14 say -- and I did try to do this a little bit earlier in 15 the deposition -- that I have suspected in some rare 16 cases that diversion was occurring and made adjustments 17 accordingly, but it is not my clinical experience that 18 patients will openly admit to diversion such that it 19 becomes an obvious situation for involving, you know, 20 criminal justice, and that most of my knowledge from 21 patients about the diversion activities is diversion that 22 they have engaged in in the distant past, after they're 23 already in recovery. 24 Q. So these suspicious cases, for example, you 25 would get a tox screen that was inconsistent with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 213</p> <p>1 Diversion is not something that I was even aware 2 of or looked for or was trained to look for in medical 3 school or residency. So in the '90s and early -- in the 4 '90s, when I was prescribing opioids as part of my role 5 as a resident or a physician in training, I didn't even 6 know what diversion meant. Didn't have the first concept 7 about it. 8 It's really only since I've become an addiction 9 medicine specialist and I'm now running a clinic that I 10 appreciate what diversion is and have a checks and 11 balances in place to monitor, to the best of my ability, 12 what diversion is all about. And I attribute that to the 13 lack of proper training that I got in this regard. 14 So, sorry, I just wanted to qualify that. 15 Q. So among the checks and balances, for example, 16 did you cut off the -- stop the prescription to that 17 particular patient? I just want to know what you do. 18 A. Yeah. So it depends on the individual patient. 19 And again, these aren't obvious cases of diversion where 20 these -- you know, these aren't like people who are 21 running a drug business. This is most often -- or I 22 would say all of my patients who I am aware of may have 23 engaged in some level of diversion, I had a suspicion for 24 it. It was not confirmed. 25 But the first order of business is to discuss</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 214</p> <p>1 with the patient that I'm concerned about diversion or 2 misuse, to ask them whether or not they can verify that 3 that behavior is happening. 4 Patients will typically -- will often admit to a 5 misuse problem. Will not typically admit to a diversion 6 problem. 7 And then what I will typically do is talk about 8 alternative treatment strategies. You know, this is not 9 working for you. We need to think of a higher level of 10 care or another intervention of some sort. And there are 11 myriad treatments for opioid addiction. 12 So I will then begin to steer them in that 13 direction. 14 Q. Okay. So in any of these, say, double-digit 15 instances where you suspected diversion, did you need 16 Mallinckrodt or any defendant to detect and counteract 17 that diversion for your patient? 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 19 THE WITNESS: I mean, Mallinckrodt is the reason 20 that, you know, the opioid epidemic, this problem is on 21 my doorstep in the first place. Without Mallinckrodt, I 22 probably wouldn't be an addiction specialist. 23 Q. BY MR. TSAI: I'm talking about your checks and 24 balances for your patients. Did you call Mallinckrodt 25 and did you need them to do that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 216</p> <p>1 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let's take -- take up where we 2 were talking about, so let's take the example of one of 3 your actual patients, you had a suspicion that he or she 4 was diverting the opioids that you had prescribed. For 5 example, you did a urine tox screen, it wasn't consistent 6 with his taking the regimen. 7 In any of those instances where you suspected 8 diversion, did you report that to the police or any 9 other -- any other authority? 10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 11 THE WITNESS: So the suspicion for diversion 12 when a urine drug screen is negative must be included in 13 the differential diagnosis for that negative drug screen 14 in a patient who's being prescribed an opioid. But it's 15 not the only thing that may be going on. 16 As I said before, it could be an honest error. 17 It could be an inaccuracy in the drug test itself, 18 necessitating confirmatory testing in some cases. It 19 could be even misuse on the part of that individual, for 20 example, taking more of the drug than prescribed and then 21 running out early, and hence not having any drug in their 22 system at the time. 23 So I have never been in a situation where my 24 threshold of suspicion regarding diversion was enough to 25 motivate me to involve anybody else except for the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 215</p> <p>1 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 2 Q. BY MR. TSAI: To take that action? 3 A. To take what action? 4 Q. To detect the addiction of your patient and then 5 to take an action to check and balance that? 6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 7 THE WITNESS: That would be great if 8 Mallinckrodt wanted to get involved in creating an 9 infrastructure to help with that. I think that isn't 10 beyond the scope of what might be reasonable for somebody 11 who manufactures opioids. 12 Q. BY MR. TSAI: I'm saying in your history, you 13 had this practice, you had these patients -- 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. -- was Mallinckrodt involved, any defendant? 16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 17 THE WITNESS: Not directly involved, but 18 indirectly involved in the way I described. 19 MR. ARBITBLIT: Let's take a break. 20 MR. TSAI: Okay. 21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the 22 time is 2:31 p.m. 23 (Recess.) 24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time 25 is 2:48 p.m.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 217</p> <p>1 patient and their immediate team, in some instances, 2 including family members, and also to prompt me to change 3 my care of that individual. 4 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. 5 A. So I always do something. 6 Q. Yeah. 7 A. But I have never been in a situation where 8 the -- the -- I was so convinced that diversion was 9 occurring that I then felt it needed to be reported to an 10 outside entity. 11 Q. Okay. So in other words, the suspicion of 12 illegal diversion could be a false positive? 13 A. That is true. 14 Q. All right. It is not easy to ascertain whether 15 a suspicion of diversion, in fact, equals actual illegal 16 activity. Agree? 17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. Object to form. 18 THE WITNESS: You'll note that I said that even 19 in the absence of knowing for sure whether diversion is 20 taking place, I assume on some level that it could be and 21 I take action in response. And that's very important 22 piece, that I don't say, oh, well, it might be happening, 23 but I'm not sure so I'm just going to continue business 24 as usual. I don't do that. 25 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So in that example, at the ground</p>

55 (Pages 214 - 217)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 218</p> <p>1 level when you had a suspicion of diversion, Mallinckrodt</p> <p>2 or any of the defendant business -- businesses, they</p> <p>3 wouldn't have known about that situation because you</p> <p>4 didn't report it out.</p> <p>5 Do you agree?</p> <p>6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>7 Q. BY MR. TSAI: That particular instance of</p> <p>8 suspected diversion?</p> <p>9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Mallinckrodt would not have known</p> <p>11 about that suspected diversion necessarily unless that</p> <p>12 diversion was happening at such a high rate among so many</p> <p>13 providers that it was contributing to a serious Public</p> <p>14 Health problem in my community, at which point the death</p> <p>15 and addiction statistics should be sufficient to alert</p> <p>16 Mallinckrodt that a diversion problem is taking place.</p> <p>17 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So in that instance -- let's talk</p> <p>18 about this example of your actual patient -- you agree</p> <p>19 you were in a better position compared to a Mallinckrodt</p> <p>20 or any of the other defendant businesses here to detect</p> <p>21 that instance of diversion?</p> <p>22 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I think you could make the</p> <p>24 opposite argument, that, in fact, Mallinckrodt, which has</p> <p>25 access to the ARCOS database that I, an individual</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 220</p> <p>1 adverse consequences due to prescription opioids that</p> <p>2 they should have and could have acted on, but they did</p> <p>3 not act on, and that they, in fact, are better equipped</p> <p>4 to do that than I, an individual practitioner, who is</p> <p>5 only seeing this isolated instance of this one patient</p> <p>6 and may not have an aggregate sense of what's happening</p> <p>7 in the community.</p> <p>8 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Well, the population, whether it's</p> <p>9 five or ten or a hundred, is made up of individuals;</p> <p>10 right?</p> <p>11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: (Nods head.)</p> <p>13 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So is that a "yes"?</p> <p>14 A. A population is made up of individuals.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So can you explain to me in this example,</p> <p>16 how you believe any defendant could have or should have</p> <p>17 known about this instance of diversion?</p> <p>18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection. Asked and answered</p> <p>19 badgering, redundant.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I feel like I -- I answered</p> <p>21 the question at the level that it needed to be answered.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. What about for this</p> <p>23 individual?</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>25 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Because that's the level I think</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 219</p> <p>1 front-line clinician don't have access to and don't know</p> <p>2 about, would be in a better position to detect population</p> <p>3 level diversion than I as an individual practitioner</p> <p>4 might be.</p> <p>5 Q. BY MR. TSAI: I didn't ask about population.</p> <p>6 I'm saying Bob Chen, your patient who had failed his tox</p> <p>7 screen, and you didn't report that out to anyone, how</p> <p>8 would Mallinckrodt, in that example, know that there was</p> <p>9 diversion going on?</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Can you explain?</p> <p>12 A. I think I did explain. I think I gave an answer</p> <p>13 to that.</p> <p>14 Q. No, that example, that they know in that.</p> <p>15 Your opinion -- you're telling the jury you</p> <p>16 believe Mallinckrodt should have known that Bob Chen</p> <p>17 failed his tox test even though you didn't report it out</p> <p>18 to anyone. I just want to see if that's your opinion.</p> <p>19 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: My opinion is broader than what</p> <p>21 you're trying to get me to agree to, and that's why I'm</p> <p>22 not willing to agree to it.</p> <p>23 My opinion is that Mallinckrodt and other</p> <p>24 defendants had access to population-level data that could</p> <p>25 have informed -- that did inform their knowledge of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 221</p> <p>1 it needs to be answered.</p> <p>2 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: But it's a hypothetical situation.</p> <p>7 First it was Mr. Smith and then it was Mr. Chen.</p> <p>8 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Yeah. And the order from this</p> <p>9 Court is that assumptions based on facts -- your</p> <p>10 Interrogatory, that's when we asked you to assume is</p> <p>11 true -- you have to answer. So let's focus on that.</p> <p>12 I assume that Mr. Chen, your patient, failed his</p> <p>13 urine tox test. You did not report it out to anyone.</p> <p>14 You suspected that he was criminally diverting it by</p> <p>15 selling it, giving it to people who -- who shouldn't have</p> <p>16 gotten it.</p> <p>17 Explain to me in that concrete example, given</p> <p>18 that hypothetical you have to assume is true, how any of</p> <p>19 the defendant businesses would be able to detect that</p> <p>20 diversion?</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection. Incomplete</p> <p>22 hypothetical.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Again, I feel like I answered it.</p> <p>24 Although the defendants may not have been aware of that</p> <p>25 individual isolated case of mine -- I concede that to</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p> <p>1 you -- they had been aware on an aggregate level of the</p> <p>2 harm due to the oversupply of opioids, including the</p> <p>3 problem of diversion, and yet they did nothing about it.</p> <p>4 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let's go back to the agree or</p> <p>5 disagree. I have some other propositions.</p> <p>6 Agree or disagree in your opinion: Patients for</p> <p>7 whom chronic opioid therapy are being considered should</p> <p>8 be screened for risks and contraindications.</p> <p>9 A. There is no evidence that screening patients</p> <p>10 prior to initiating opioid therapy reduces their risk of</p> <p>11 developing an opioid use problem. We do not have good</p> <p>12 screening tools. So hypothetically, it makes sense, if</p> <p>13 we could parse out those 30 percent of individuals who's</p> <p>14 going to develop an opioid use problem from the rest,</p> <p>15 that would be great, but we don't have the tools to do</p> <p>16 that.</p> <p>17 And in educating physicians that screening</p> <p>18 actually worked, that was another form of misrepresenting</p> <p>19 the evidence.</p> <p>20 Q. So just to be clear, in your opinion, would</p> <p>21 stating that proposition to practitioners, "patients for</p> <p>22 whom chronic opioid therapy is being considered should be</p> <p>23 screened for risks and contraindications," be misleading?</p> <p>24 A. I think it's -- I think it's misleading because</p> <p>25 it's incomplete.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p> <p>1 misleading to practitioners?</p> <p>2 A. Yeah, I think that would be misleading.</p> <p>3 Q. What about this one: Physicians should also</p> <p>4 perform ongoing risk-benefit assessments throughout the</p> <p>5 course of therapy because problems can arise at any</p> <p>6 point?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I would agree with that.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. How about this one: Patients should be</p> <p>9 reevaluated at least every three months, even when stable</p> <p>10 and doing well, and more frequently if problems arise?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, I agree with that.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. How about this: The risk for opioid</p> <p>13 abuse is increased in patients with a personal or family</p> <p>14 history of substance abuse, including drug or alcohol</p> <p>15 abuse or addiction, or mental illness, for example, major</p> <p>16 depression?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, I agree with that.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Agree or disagree in your opinion with</p> <p>19 this proposition: Patients at increased risk may still</p> <p>20 be appropriately treated with modified-release opioid</p> <p>21 formulations, however, these patients will require</p> <p>22 intensive monitoring for signs of misuse, abuse or</p> <p>23 addiction?</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Objection.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Can you restate just because the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p> <p>1 Q. How about this one: Before initiating chronic</p> <p>2 opioid therapy, physicians should take adequate time to</p> <p>3 inform patients in simple language of the associated</p> <p>4 risks?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, I agree with that.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay.</p> <p>7 A. Assuming that that physician is properly</p> <p>8 educated on what those risks are.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. How about this one: Patient education</p> <p>10 can help curb opioid misuse and reduce the risk of</p> <p>11 developing opioid use disorder?</p> <p>12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I don't think that we don't have</p> <p>14 good data to show whether or not educating patients will</p> <p>15 actually curb their risk of opioid misuse. I think it's</p> <p>16 a logical assumption, but it's not actually been proven</p> <p>17 to be the case, and I can tell you that the way that</p> <p>18 opioids working on the brain is that they are reenforcing</p> <p>19 beyond what the patient may understand about their risks.</p> <p>20 So it's a logical proposition, but I don't</p> <p>21 believe there's evidence to actually show that educating</p> <p>22 patients about the risks reduces their chances of</p> <p>23 developing opioid use problem.</p> <p>24 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So then just to be clear:</p> <p>25 Do you believe stating that proposition would be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p> <p>1 transcription is not accurately represented. It says</p> <p>2 "real estate" opioid formulation. So would you repeat?</p> <p>3 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. What about this</p> <p>4 proposition: Patients at increased risk may still be</p> <p>5 appropriately treated with opioid medications; however,</p> <p>6 these patients will require intensive monitoring for</p> <p>7 signs of misuse, abuse or addiction?</p> <p>8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I think it's really important to</p> <p>10 qualify whether we're talking about short-term opioid</p> <p>11 therapy or long-term opioid therapy because the risks</p> <p>12 really diverge there.</p> <p>13 I do agree that even patients with addiction may</p> <p>14 at times need a short-term course of opioid therapy for</p> <p>15 pain and that those individuals are at increased risk.</p> <p>16 But it's also true that per Edlund, the risk of</p> <p>17 developing opioid use problem -- the greatest risk factor</p> <p>18 is actually dose and duration of the opioid -- the higher</p> <p>19 the dose, the longer the patient's on it, and that that</p> <p>20 risk outweighs any personal or family history of an</p> <p>21 opioid use problem.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let's specifically substitute</p> <p>23 in an extended-release opioid medication. If we put that</p> <p>24 in, patients at increased risk may still be appropriately</p> <p>25 treated with an extended-release opioid formulation,</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p> <p>1 would you agree or disagree with that?</p> <p>2 A. Can you say the whole proposition again?</p> <p>3 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>4 Patients at an increased risk may still be</p> <p>5 appropriately treated with extended-release opioid</p> <p>6 formulations; however, these patients will require</p> <p>7 intensive monitoring for signs of misuse, abuse or</p> <p>8 addiction?</p> <p>9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I think there would -- and when</p> <p>11 you say extended release, you mean short-term, long-term</p> <p>12 opioid therapy. I'll object because --</p> <p>13 (Interruption in proceedings.)</p> <p>14 MR. TSAI: Someone's -- I think someone's not on</p> <p>15 mute. We can hear you.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So in general, I don't</p> <p>17 agree.</p> <p>18 (Interruption in proceedings.)</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: So I don't believe that opioid</p> <p>20 long-term opioid therapy is --</p> <p>21 (Interruption in proceedings.)</p> <p>22 THE REPORTER: Can we go off the record?</p> <p>23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the</p> <p>24 time is 3:02 p.m.</p> <p>25 (Discussion off the record.)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p> <p>1 conditions, including addiction, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And psychiatric comorbidities is also a risk</p> <p>3 factor.</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. That's a big term, big mouthful. Can you</p> <p>6 explain to the jury what that means?</p> <p>7 A. That means an individual who has a psychiatric</p> <p>8 disorder other than the disease of addiction. So that</p> <p>9 would include everything from major depression to</p> <p>10 obsessive compulsive order to bipolar disorder to</p> <p>11 schizophrenia.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. So given all these risk factors, do you</p> <p>13 agree that healthcare providers should assess each</p> <p>14 individual for opioid risk based on specific factors?</p> <p>15 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Healthcare providers should assess</p> <p>17 risk factors for opioid addiction informed by the</p> <p>18 knowledge that patients who screen positive for those</p> <p>19 risk factors are not the only patients who are at risk</p> <p>20 for developing opioid use problems, and that, in fact,</p> <p>21 our screening tools are not effective at predicting who</p> <p>22 will and will not develop an opioid use disorder.</p> <p>23 So although we have no predictive tools, I</p> <p>24 nonetheless do endorse screening for those risk factors</p> <p>25 as part of a complete medical exam.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p> <p>1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time</p> <p>2 is 3:03 p.m.</p> <p>3 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Do you agree that risk</p> <p>4 factors for opioid addiction other than mere exposure</p> <p>5 exist?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Is one of those risk factors for opioid</p> <p>8 addiction a personal history of a substance use disorder?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Same question for family history of a</p> <p>11 substance use disorder.</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Same question for a history of doctor shopping.</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Same question for a history of seeking early</p> <p>16 refills.</p> <p>17 A. So in general, doctor shopping and early refills</p> <p>18 is highly correlated with prescription opioid misuse, and</p> <p>19 prescription opioid misuse is highly correlated,</p> <p>20 predictive of developing an opioid use disorder. So,</p> <p>21 yes. Whether it's a causative or a risk factor, but yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Same question: Preadolescent history of</p> <p>23 sexual abuse is also a risk factor for opioid addiction.</p> <p>24 A. Childhood trauma in general is a risk factor for</p> <p>25 many medical conditions, including mental health</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 229</p> <p>1 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. So can we agree that all</p> <p>2 things being equal, a person with either active or a</p> <p>3 history of substance use disorders is a higher risk</p> <p>4 candidate for opioid therapy than a person with no past</p> <p>5 or current history of substance use disorders?</p> <p>6 A. I'm not sure we actually can agree to that</p> <p>7 because although we can look at large populations and see</p> <p>8 who has an opioid use disorder and see who has those risk</p> <p>9 factors and note higher prevalence of those risk factors</p> <p>10 in patients who develop an opioid use disorder, we still</p> <p>11 do not as of yet have a clinical predictive tool that</p> <p>12 will allow us to screen for anything in order to be able</p> <p>13 to separate who will and will not develop an opioid use</p> <p>14 disorder.</p> <p>15 The bottom line importantly being that even</p> <p>16 patients with none of those risk factors can develop an</p> <p>17 opioid use disorder, period.</p> <p>18 Q. How about this: Patients who are prescribed</p> <p>19 opioids are not all at equal risk for developing opioid</p> <p>20 addiction?</p> <p>21 A. Patients who are on higher doses for longer</p> <p>22 duration are at increased risk of developing opioid risk</p> <p>23 disorder. Patients who have some of the risk factors</p> <p>24 you've mentioned, like co-occurring psychiatric</p> <p>25 disorders, are at increased risk of developing opioid use</p>

58 (Pages 226 - 229)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 230</p> <p>1 disorder, but the relative risk of dose and duration 2 outweigh the risks of those other -- those other risk 3 factors. 4 Q. And the dose of an opioid medication for a 5 particular patient can change over time. Agreed? 6 A. In fact, it typically does change over time as 7 patients develop tolerance, given the way that we've been 8 practicing, to respond to tolerance by increasing the 9 dose, given the way that we have been miseducated to 10 believe that quote/unquote no dose is too high. 11 Q. And it's the doctor who decides what dose of an 12 opioid medication his or her individual patient receives, 13 when prescribed, and over the course of treatment. 14 Do you agree? 15 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 16 THE WITNESS: Yes and no. 17 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Who else decides -- who else 18 decides the dosage regimen of a particular doctor's 19 particular patient? 20 A. So the amount and duration and choice of the 21 opioid is heavily influenced by things like what's on the 22 pharmacy formulary for a given hospital or what that 23 patient's insurance will cover or whether or not the 24 Joint Commission infiltrated that hospital and said you'd 25 better, in so many words, prescribe opioids to any</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 232</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: So you've asked me a hypothetical 2 so I'm going to answer by talking about how I practice. 3 Because we're not talking about a specific patient. 4 And the way that I practice, which I think is 5 informed by the evidence and many years of clinical 6 experience, is that any patient, regardless of those -- 7 having or not having those risk factors, is at risk for 8 developing an opioid use problem. And so I treat all of 9 my patients the same in that regard, with the same level 10 of caution and the same level of monitoring and 11 vigilance. 12 Q. BY MR. TSAI: And you say "at risk." My 13 question is in that scenario, comparing those two 14 individual patient cases, is it your opinion that they 15 have the same risk, different risk? What is that? What 16 is your opinion on that? Not at risk, but the degree of 17 risk. 18 A. So when we're talking about clinical care and 19 I'm sitting in my office dealing with real, live 20 patients, I fully acknowledge that I have no crystal ball 21 for being able to determine who will and will not develop 22 an opioid use problem. 23 I have seen many patients like your hypothetical 24 Mrs. Smith, high functioning, well educated, high-paying 25 job, no core current mental illness, no history of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 231</p> <p>1 patient that endorses pain above a given level. 2 Or in a situation where a patient has demanded a 3 certain opioid prescription and rated that -- that doctor 4 poorly because of it or in a situation where that 5 patient -- that doctor may be afraid that they will get 6 sued or lose their medical license if they don't do 7 everything in their power, i.e., prescribe an opioid to 8 treat that patient's pain. 9 So lots of invisible forces inside of medicine 10 driving prescribing, which the defendants in this case 11 well understood and exploited in order to promote their 12 products. 13 Q. Let me ask you this, and this is a hypothetical: 14 So let's assume the same dose and duration for Mrs. Smith 15 and Mr. Chen, same dose and duration. Mrs. Smith has 16 never been depressed, never taken drugs before, never had 17 a family member who took drugs, has a high-paying job, 18 and then took an opioid medication for a legitimate pain 19 condition. 20 In your opinion, would Mrs. Smith have the same 21 risk of addiction as someone, call him Mr. Chen, with a 22 long history of severe depression, history of prior 23 illicit drug use, family history of drug use, unemployed, 24 and who was doctor shopping? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 233</p> <p>1 substance use problems, who goes on to very quickly 2 develop an opioid use disorder in the context of 3 receiving a prescription from a doctor. 4 Likewise, I have seen patients like your 5 hypothetical Mr. Chen -- depressed, unemployed, doctor 6 shopping -- who doesn't develop an opioid addiction. 7 So when we're talking about the level of 8 clinical care -- not population-level studies, but 9 clinical care and my ability to prognosticate, I assume I 10 have zero ability to do that. 11 Q. Okay. So that -- now you kind of reversed. 12 First you were in population mode and -- 13 A. Yep. 14 MR. ARBITBLIT: Ask a question, Counsel. Don't 15 lecture. 16 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So let's talk about population 17 level. 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Don't lecture the witness, 19 Counsel. Ask a question. 20 Q. MR. TSAI: Do you have an opinion as to the 21 relative degree of risk on a population level, given that 22 scenario? 23 A. So I cite Edlund in my report. On page 20. 24 Q. So we're on the same page -- 25 A. Yeah.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 234</p> <p>1 Q. -- in terms of interpreting reading Edlund, you</p> <p>2 agree that Edlund was a -- was a study about</p> <p>3 associations, not --</p> <p>4 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>5 Q. -- not causal relationships?</p> <p>6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I agree that Edlund talks about</p> <p>8 risk factors in a population of individuals who were</p> <p>9 exposed to opioid therapy versus not.</p> <p>10 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay.</p> <p>11 A. I'm trying to determine the risk of individuals,</p> <p>12 the odds ratio of developing an opioid use disorder based</p> <p>13 on a certain type of risk factor.</p> <p>14 I'm looking for another place that I cite Edlund</p> <p>15 in my report. Give me a moment, please.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. I don't want to spend too much time --</p> <p>17 A. Okay.</p> <p>18 Q. -- given our limited time. So --</p> <p>19 A. I did -- I did find it.</p> <p>20 If you'd like me to refer to it, page 73.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>22 A. The Edlund study.</p> <p>23 Q. So did you do -- so other than the risk -- the</p> <p>24 several risk factors for opioid addiction that we've</p> <p>25 discussed, any others?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 236</p> <p>1 information on how average daily dose and duration of</p> <p>2 opioid therapy may supply likelihood of development of an</p> <p>3 incident of opioid use disorder is limited, do you have</p> <p>4 any reason to dispute that conclusion by the study</p> <p>5 authors?</p> <p>6 A. Where is that? Where is that?</p> <p>7 Q. Page 2 of Edlund, 24.</p> <p>8 MR. ARBITBLIT: Do you have the article?</p> <p>9 MR. TSAI: I think she's looking at it.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: No, I don't have the article. I</p> <p>11 just have my reference.</p> <p>12 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Let's move on.</p> <p>13 So do you agree or disagree with this</p> <p>14 statement --</p> <p>15 (Discussion off the record.)</p> <p>16 MR. TSAI: Let me go off the record real quick.</p> <p>17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the</p> <p>18 time is 3:18 p.m.</p> <p>19 (Exhibit 7, Pre-roll: Mischa intro, marked for</p> <p>20 identification.)</p> <p>21 (Discussion off the record.)</p> <p>22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time</p> <p>23 is 3:20 p.m.</p> <p>24 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So I just wanted to ask you about</p> <p>25 this interview that you gave. This -- I handed you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 235</p> <p>1 MR. ARBITBLIT: I don't think she had finished</p> <p>2 answering the question when she referred to Edlund. You</p> <p>3 interrupted her.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Do you want me to finish answering</p> <p>5 your other question?</p> <p>6 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Actually, it seemed like you were</p> <p>7 talking about something a bit different so let me just</p> <p>8 ask you this: In terms of the several risk factors out</p> <p>9 there, with respect to opioid addiction did you do any</p> <p>10 analysis of your own in your work in this case to</p> <p>11 quantify the contribution of these risk factors to opioid</p> <p>12 addiction in New York specifically?</p> <p>13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I do not any of my own analyses,</p> <p>15 but as per my report, including on page 73, Edlund did</p> <p>16 quantify these risk factors, stating that for chronic</p> <p>17 high-dose opioid use, the odds ratio of approximately 122</p> <p>18 is 40 times greater than for a mental health or alcohol</p> <p>19 use disorder and 15 times higher than for a prior</p> <p>20 non-opioid-use disorder.</p> <p>21 In other words, the chronic use of opioids is</p> <p>22 responsible for far more opioid use disorders than the</p> <p>23 existence of identifiable risk factors for opioid use</p> <p>24 disorders.</p> <p>25 Q. BY MR. TSAI: And when Edlund himself says</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 237</p> <p>1 Exhibit 7, which is entitled "Science Versus," from</p> <p>2 Gimlet Media with Wendy Zukerman. The program is</p> <p>3 entitled "Opioids, Kicking America's Addiction."</p> <p>4 Do you recall giving interview for this program?</p> <p>5 A. Not specifically.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Can you refer to page 4? And I'll direct</p> <p>7 you to the very top of page 4. And it says: "Anna</p> <p>8 Lembke, a psychiatrist at Stanford, was one of those</p> <p>9 doctors who wasn't keen to treat addicts."</p> <p>10 Do you see that?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And do you see the abbreviation "AL" henceforth</p> <p>13 under that?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Is "AL" you?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And does this appear to be a correct</p> <p>18 transcription of your interview for this program?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. I just wanted to quickly ask you about on</p> <p>21 page 11, there is a series of footnotes. Number 15 --</p> <p>22 52, sorry, states in email, "Don't let anyone tell you</p> <p>23 taking a medication is swapping one addiction for</p> <p>24 another. It is complete nonsense."</p> <p>25 And the -- that corresponds to a sentence in the</p>

60 (Pages 234 - 237)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 238</p> <p>1 text saying, "Here's how Anna and other experts think 2 about it." 3 Do you see that? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Okay. Do you know if you still have that email? 6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. That's 7 misrepresenting the evidence. 8 THE WITNESS: I have no idea. 9 MR. ARBITBLIT: It doesn't link this to Anna in 10 any way. 11 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Is it your understanding that you 12 sent Wendy Zukerman an email with this statement? 13 A. I don't have a recollection of having sent that 14 email, no. 15 Q. Okay. Okay. 16 So you can put that aside. 17 A. Okay. 18 (Exhibit 8, Handwritten notes, 1/16/14, marked 19 for identification.) 20 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So I believe we talked about this 21 at the last deposition, but this is -- I'm handing you 22 what you produced when we requested your -- your notes in 23 connection with writing your book -- 24 A. Uh-huh. 25 Q. -- Drug Dealer, M.D., do you recall that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 240</p> <p>1 A. Oh, you're not counting both sides? 2 Q. Eight. Eight flips, please. 3 A. Just one? 4 Q. Yes, that's one. 5 A. Okay. 6 Q. Since I'm not all that good at reading 7 handwriting, I just did -- I did want to just confirm the 8 accuracy of -- of the notes. 9 Do you see at top it says: "I could control it 10 at first," and then right under that, it says "right 11 after 9/11"? 12 A. I don't see that at the top. I wonder if I'm on 13 the same page. Okay, yes, I do see that now. 14 Q. Great. And since you know your handwriting much 15 better than I do -- 16 A. Right. 17 Q. -- would you mind reading this particular 18 interview, this particular page? 19 A. Sure. 20 "I could control it at first right. After 9/11, 21 huge influx of cheap, super pure, chronic white heroin. 22 \$50 could last me two to three weeks. Am I becoming a 23 heroin addict? I started reading William Burrough's book 24 to see if it was me. The first time I went into heroin 25 withdrawal, I didn't know it. I thought I just had the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 239</p> <p>1 A. Yes, I do. 2 Q. Okay. I'm not actually sure I asked the 3 question, but does this -- can you confirm that this 4 appears to be a true and correct copy of your notes with 5 respect to interviewing folks for your book Drug Dealer, 6 M.D.? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Okay. Now, there's one -- they're not numbered 9 so I want to ask you about -- 10 MR. TSAI: Actually, can we go off the record. 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the 12 time is 3:24 p.m. 13 (Discussion off the record.) 14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time 15 is 3:25 p.m. 16 MR. TSAI: Thank you. 17 Q. So I've handed you -- we're looking at 18 Exhibit 8, your notes in connection with your book. 19 Could you please turn nine pages from the beginning, and 20 I apologize. This doesn't have -- I mean your notes do 21 not have internal pagination. So if you could flip nine 22 full pages. 23 A. Nine pages from where we were? 24 Q. No, from the front. So let's count: One, two, 25 three, four, five, six, seven, eight.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 241</p> <p>1 flu. 2 After two to three months of daily heroin use, I 3 went back to California to get away from heroin and get 4 my life together. I talked to my mom about it. 5 Back in New York City, I got buprenorphine as 6 intramuscularly injected in a glass vial so I injected 7 and I was doing Buprenex early 2001. It worked well the 8 first time. 9 Moved back to New York. Six months, no heroin, 10 but then I relapsed. Then I used needles to inject 11 heroin using the Buprenex needles. Problems would happen 12 when I would go out and have a drink or two, even after a 13 party until 2:00 to 4:00 -- 2:00 to 4:00 in the morning, 14 at 11:00 p.m. cocaine was useful. 15 I relapsed, alcohol to cocaine to heroin. Today 16 use to maintenance therapy. Why not just stay on heroin? 17 Tolerance going up and up to the point where I had an 18 over a hundred dollar a day habit, trouble at school, 19 nodding off. 20 Q. Okay. Thank you. 21 And just one point of clarification. On line 3, 22 when you read "cheap, super pure," is the word after that 23 China? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. China, okay.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 242</p> <p>1 So in your opinion, would this individual have 2 opioid use disorder?</p> <p>3 A. Yes, this individual had opioid use disorder.</p> <p>4 Q. And taking this individual as an example, would 5 you include this individual in what you've termed your 6 dependence effect?</p> <p>7 A. So this individual is actually a great example 8 of the tsunami effect, which is to say that although 9 she's in a minority group, having started her addiction 10 with heroin, we know that's a minority group because more 11 than 80 percent, according to Cicero, of heroin users 12 today began with a prescription opioid.</p> <p>13 She is somebody who then went from heroin to 14 prescription opioids, which resulted in an exacerbation 15 of her opioid use disorder, and I describe that several 16 pages later, where she was admitted to the hospital for 17 an abscess and a skin infection. And if you don't mind, 18 I will read from my notes here to get a sense of what 19 happened to her afterwards.</p> <p>20 So she -- she was -- I think it's super 21 relevant, super relevant to answering your question. So 22 if you don't mind, I'd just like to read this short 23 passage.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay, sure. Which page is it?</p> <p>25 A. This is just a couple pages after the page that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 244</p> <p>1 She worried about how people would treat her. 2 Doctors wouldn't work to save my life if they knew I 3 wanted to get pain medication. Why is a healthy 4 24-year-old -- I can't read something -- dying.</p> <p>5 Then she got IV Dilaudid to treat her pain and 6 IV fentanyl. She had huge tolerance because she'd been 7 using heroin. She had surgery every other day just 8 trying to keep me alive.</p> <p>9 3.5 five weeks in the ICU. At Stanford three 10 months. IV Dilaudid every day. Full -- full anesthesia 11 just to do the bandage changes every other day.</p> <p>12 Flesh on calves and feet also rotted off. 13 Sedated much of the time. Couldn't walk. Couldn't use 14 on my own. IV vanco.</p> <p>15 And then importantly, she spent almost three to 16 six months at Stanford. Opioids were part of her daily 17 regimen, and then she was given morphine tablets, 20 to 18 30 per month, and she was discharged with that high 19 volume of pills, which she continued to get.</p> <p>20 She dissolved them in saline and injected them in 21 her PIC line. So she was not given any addiction 22 treatment. There wasn't awareness of her disease.</p> <p>23 Then she got 5150 because the police came along 24 and found her heating and injecting her extended-release 25 morphine.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 243</p> <p>1 you indicated.</p> <p>2 Q. So two pages after what you just read into the 3 record?</p> <p>4 A. I think so. And you will see "IV fentanyl" at 5 the top.</p> <p>6 Q. That's three pages sequentially after what you 7 just read into the record. Okay.</p> <p>8 A. Okay. So actually, just before the IV fentanyl 9 page, the prior page you'll see, in the second large 10 paragraph, third sentence down, it says she was clean for 11 six months. Then she had an infection at her injection 12 site, MRSA -- which stands for Methicillin-resistant 13 Staphylococcus aureus infection. Her arm was turning 14 green and puffy, really scary. Then she relapsed to her 15 dad's Dilaudid.</p> <p>16 So, again, a great example of the tsunami 17 effect, just the ubiquitous supply of prescription 18 opioids in the community.</p> <p>19 She was rushed to Stanford. Delirium, septic. 20 Part of her arm rotted off. Didn't tell the doctors 21 about the heroin.</p> <p>22 Another great example of why it's so hard for 23 front-line doctors to intervene, because they can't get 24 the straight story from the patients themselves because 25 there's so much stigma around this problem.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 245</p> <p>1 And that was the first time they realized that I 2 was basically suffering from an opioid use disorder.</p> <p>3 But my -- my point in -- I think that's a really 4 important piece to include in the story because what we 5 have is this very complex relationship between illicit 6 opioids, nonmedical use of prescription opioids, and 7 legitimate use of prescription opioids. And all of those 8 things interweave in really important ways that increase 9 the risk of addiction overdose death for all Americans 10 and would only have been possible because of the 11 increased prescribing and increased supply, the nearly 12 ubiquitous access, as a result in part of defendants' 13 actions.</p> <p>14 Q. And given this case history that we just 15 discussed, would you include this individual within the 16 scope of your gateway effect?</p> <p>17 A. This individual wouldn't be included in gateway 18 because she didn't begin with a prescription opioid, but 19 she certainly would be included in the tsunami effect.</p> <p>20 Q. As well as the dependence effect?</p> <p>21 A. Yes. Because she -- the dependence effect is 22 speaking more to those individuals who have developed a 23 physiologic dependence to opioids, who don't meet clear 24 criteria for an opioid use disorder. So she would really 25 be in the tsunami effect.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 246</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Would you include this individual, given 2 her case history and her development of addiction while 3 she was in New York, within the scope of your -- of New 4 York residents whose opioid addiction you would hold 5 defendants responsible for? 6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 7 THE WITNESS: So obviously when she was living 8 in New York, that's when she started on heroin, not 9 prescription opioids. But that doesn't release 10 defendants from their responsibility regarding the opioid 11 epidemic nationally, including in New York. 12 Q. BY MR. TSAI: So you would include this 13 individual? 14 A. Yes, for the reasons that -- that I described 15 having to do with how her opioid addiction was made worse 16 because of the prescribing of prescription -- because of 17 access to prevention opioids that followed her heroin 18 use. 19 Q. And she wasn't prescribed that particular 20 prescription opioid in her case; is that right? She got 21 it from her dad. Am I reading that correctly? 22 A. No. So -- so there is an instance in which she 23 got it from her father. That was the Dilaudid. But then 24 she received high doses of opioids inhouse, and she was 25 discharged with morphine sulfate, which she then</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 248</p> <p>1 So as I state in my report: "In the state of 2 New York, opioid prescribing increased from 101 morphine 3 milligram equivalence in 1997 to 442 by 2006 and again 4 increased to 492 per person in 2016," which would refute 5 your claim that in New York opioid prescribing started to 6 decrease around 2011. 7 It's also true that if you look at the duration 8 of the prescription in New York, the length of opioid 9 prescriptions actually increased between 2016 and 2017 10 from 15 to 19 days of opioids in 2017, an increase of 11 25 percent. 12 Q. Okay. Just let me try to understand. 13 In your report, you said based on a -- 14 (Interruption in proceedings.) 15 Q. BY MR. TSAI: I read in your report based on 16 IQVA data published by County by the CDC, the opioid 17 prescribing rate in Nassau County increased from 46.0 to 18 51.1 prescriptions per hundred persons from 2006 to 2011. 19 Thereafter, prescribing decreased similarly to the rest 20 of New York state, with the rate per 100 persons of 36.0 21 in the most recent year of data available, 2017. 22 Do you see that? 23 A. Yes, I do. 24 Q. That's in your report? 25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 247</p> <p>1 injected. 2 Q. Okay. So I'm going to pivot and ask a short 3 series of questions now are that specific to my client, 4 Mallinckrodt, and then I'll pass to the other attorneys 5 who haven't had a chance to ask questions. 6 So is your opinion in this case based on any FDA 7 warning letter to Mallinckrodt? 8 A. I am not aware of any specific FDA warning 9 letter to Mallinckrodt; however, I do know that other 10 experts will be opining on the FDA. 11 Q. Okay. And one of the Mallinckrodt opioid 12 medicines that you reference in your report is Xartemis. 13 Do you recall that? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. And do you agree that by 2011, which was before 16 Xartemis was even on the market, opioid prescriptions per 17 person had begun decreasing in New York? 18 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 19 THE WITNESS: I think I do discuss this in my 20 report. I'd like to reference my report. 21 Q. BY MR. TSAI: I think you're looking, perhaps, 22 for page 17 through 18. 23 A. Thank you. 24 Q. Yeah. 25 A. Yes, I am.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 249</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. 2 A. Except that I want to say the reason for that 3 apparent discrepancy -- it's not an actual discrepancy -- 4 the CDC data are based on number of prescriptions written 5 per 100 persons, whereas that particular New York State 6 data is looking at how high the dose was and the length 7 of the opioid prescription. So there are different ways 8 to measure it. 9 So in terms of overall number of prescriptions 10 written, those began to decrease around 2011, 2012, but 11 the doses appeared to have gone up and the duration of 12 prescriptions appear to have gone up. 13 Q. I see. Okay. 14 Is your opinion in that this case based on 15 identifying any specific examples of individuals who 16 allegedly became addicted to any opioid as a result of a 17 prescription of a Mallinckrodt product in New York? 18 A. I don't have specific samples. 19 Q. Okay. And similarly, your opinion does not 20 identify a single specific overdose death that, in your 21 opinion, was allegedly the direct result of the ingestion 22 of any opioid made by Mallinckrodt; correct? 23 A. Not at that level of specificity, no. 24 Q. Okay. Is your opinion in this case based on 25 identifying any specific example of a particular opioid</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 250</p> <p>1 pill made by Mallinckrodt that was a suspicious order 2 diverted improperly? 3 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 4 THE WITNESS: Not any specific pill. 5 Q. BY MR. TSAI: Okay. Is your opinion in this 6 case based on identifying any specific example of a 7 prescription of a Mallinckrodt opioid written in New York 8 by a doctor or nurse relying on a representation from 9 Mallinckrodt? 10 A. Not at that level of specificity. 11 MR. TSAI: Okay. All right. 12 Let me go off the record, and I will pass the 13 witness at this time. Thank you. 14 THE WITNESS: You're welcome. 15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the 16 time is 3:42 p.m. 17 (Discussion off the record.) 18 (Exhibit 9, JAN-MS-00362490, marked for 19 identification.) 20 (Exhibit 10, Highlights of Prescribing 21 Information, marked for identification.) 22 (Exhibit 11, JAN-MS-00362490, marked for 23 identification.) 24 (Exhibit 12, Highlights of Prescribing 25 Information, marked for identification.)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 252</p> <p>1 A. Yes, I do. 2 Q. And collectively, I think you referred to it at 3 various times as the tsunami effect? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Considering access and the supply, did you 6 consider illicitly manufactured opioids that entered the 7 United States illegally? 8 A. I think that's part of the second and third 9 waves of this epidemic. The increased supply began with 10 prescription opioids, overprescribing, and then created a 11 population of individuals who were addicted to those 12 opioids, leading to increased demand, which then promoted 13 the illicit market. Including heroin and illicit 14 fentanyl. 15 So I think those things are tied in a sequential 16 manner. 17 Q. Would you agree that that supply is not going to 18 be disrupted by curbing opioid prescribing presently? 19 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 20 THE WITNESS: I disagree with that statement. 21 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: So it is your opinion that even 22 if the FDA were to ban the prescribing of all opioids, 23 that the supply side that is illicit in its manufacturing 24 and distribution would somehow be lessened by that 25 process?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 251</p> <p>1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time 2 is 3:48 p.m. 3 EXAMINATION 4 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Good afternoon, Dr. Lembke. We 5 met before at your prior deposition. My name is Houman 6 Ehsan. I represent Johnson & Johnson and the Janssen 7 defendants. Collectively, that they manufacture 8 Duragesic transdermal fentanyl patch and Nucynta or 9 tapentadol. 10 Doctor, you had talked about an efficient 11 distribution system earlier today. 12 Do you recall that testimony? 13 A. Yes, I do. 14 Q. Do you consider the US Postal Service to be an 15 efficient distribution system? 16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 17 THE WITNESS: Well, it is a distribution system. 18 I'm not sure how efficient it is. 19 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Can it reach every small town in 20 America, rain or shine? 21 A. I hope so. 22 Q. You mentioned several times that easy access and 23 supply contributed to the overall opioid epidemic in the 24 United States. 25 Do you recall that testimony?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 253</p> <p>1 A. I have never endorsed, nor would I ever endorse 2 that the FDA should ban prescribing opioids. What I have 3 stated is that the opioids have been overprescribed and 4 overdistributed and overdispensed, leading to a tsunami 5 effect. 6 And I do believe that by engaging in safer and 7 more judicious prescribing of prescription opioids, we 8 will actually also, potentially in the long, long-term, 9 be able to curb the opioid addiction problem more 10 broadly, including addiction to illicit opioids. 11 Q. Do you lay out how the curbing of opioid 12 prescribing and education, broadly speaking, will in the 13 long term reduce the supply of illicitly manufactured 14 opioids abroad? 15 A. The way that I lay that out in the report and in 16 my testimony today is the way in which both nonmedical 17 use and medical use of prescription opioids are 18 interwoven and how both independently and together 19 greatly increase the risk of an individual turning to a 20 illicit source of an opioid. 21 So by managing the prescription opioid addiction 22 oversupply, overdose problem, we will potentially treat 23 the population of addicted persons we have iatrogenically 24 created and then likewise decrease the demand for illicit 25 opioids imported from elsewhere.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 254</p> <p>1 Q. You understand that illicit opioids actually</p> <p>2 release non-opioid medications that are sold on the</p> <p>3 street as well?</p> <p>4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: I can ask the question again.</p> <p>7 Was that a "yes"?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. So someone who may have no exposure to opioids</p> <p>10 and may be addicted to cocaine may come into contact with</p> <p>11 illicitly manufactured opioids, fentanyl, specifically;</p> <p>12 correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, and they also may come into contact with</p> <p>14 illicitly manufactured opioids.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you looked at the size of the illicitly</p> <p>16 manufactured opioid market in the state of New York for</p> <p>17 your expert opinions today?</p> <p>18 A. Did you say the illicitly manufactured opioid</p> <p>19 market?</p> <p>20 Q. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>21 A. I have not specifically looked at that market in</p> <p>22 the state of New York.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know what the approximate market share of</p> <p>24 Duragesic is in New York?</p> <p>25 A. No, I do not.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 256</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And that is potentially a fatal condition from</p> <p>3 excess consumption of water; right?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5 Q. Did you, in your clinical practice, ever</p> <p>6 encounter patients who have had difficulty making</p> <p>7 co-payments for the medications that you had prescribed</p> <p>8 for them?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>10 Q. And can that financial difficulty in paying the</p> <p>11 co-pay be an obstacle to the care of your patients?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, it can.</p> <p>13 Q. Now, you mentioned earlier today that you had</p> <p>14 reviewed some documents that suggested that McKesson had</p> <p>15 provided some free samples of Nucynta.</p> <p>16 Do you recall that testimony?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>18 Q. I want to hand you what's been marked as</p> <p>19 Exhibit 9 (indicating).</p> <p>20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Do you have an extra copy?</p> <p>21 MR. EHSAN: Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. I ask you before we get to that to take a look</p> <p>23 at Exhibit 3.</p> <p>24 A. Which one is Exhibit 3?</p> <p>25 Q. Exhibit 3, yes, is your supplemental reliance</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 255</p> <p>1 Q. Do you know what the approximate market share of</p> <p>2 Nucynta is in the state of New York?</p> <p>3 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you have any historical knowledge of the</p> <p>5 market share going back in time?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you have a sense of how that market share</p> <p>8 compares to the size of the illicit market in the state</p> <p>9 of New York?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. You mentioned that even short-term opioid</p> <p>12 prescriptions are not entirely benign.</p> <p>13 Do you recall that?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>15 Q. Can you identify for me any prescription that</p> <p>16 you've written for that is entirely benign?</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>19 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Would you agree with me that even</p> <p>20 water is not entirely benign?</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I would agree that even water is</p> <p>23 not entirely benign.</p> <p>24 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: As a psychiatrist, did you have</p> <p>25 occasion to ever treat someone with diabetes insipidus?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 257</p> <p>1 list.</p> <p>2 Do you see item number 13 there?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. It is a -- it says JAN-MS-00864412; correct?</p> <p>5 A. It does say that.</p> <p>6 Q. And the document I've handed you which has been</p> <p>7 marked as Exhibit 9 bears that same Bates-stamp; correct?</p> <p>8 A. That's correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Is this one of the free samples that you were</p> <p>10 referring to regarding Nucynta?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>12 Q. I'll draw your attention to a couple of points</p> <p>13 on this. Do you see that this document has a date of</p> <p>14 April 2010 at the bottom in the left-hand column midway</p> <p>15 through, it says Ortho McNeill Janssen Pharmaceuticals,</p> <p>16 Inc., 2009. Then next to that, it says April 2010.</p> <p>17 Do you see that?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, I do see that.</p> <p>19 Q. And then is it your opinion, Doctor, that this</p> <p>20 provided the patient with free samples of Nucynta?</p> <p>21 And if it helps, you can turn to the next page,</p> <p>22 where it says "patient instruction," and item 1 says:</p> <p>23 "Give your prescription for Nucynta along with this</p> <p>24 attached savings card to your pharmacist."</p> <p>25 A. Right. So this is a coupon -- my understanding</p>

65 (Pages 254 - 257)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 258</p> <p>1 is that this is a coupon that allows the patient to be 2 able to pay less for their Nucynta prescription. 3 Q. And do you think that's equivalent to a free 4 sample? 5 A. Yeah, I think that could be equivalent to a free 6 sample. 7 Q. And you understand that Nucynta is a Schedule II 8 opioid? 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 Q. Are you aware whether or not Schedule II opioids 11 can be given as free samples? 12 A. Well, this is a way to undercut the Schedule II 13 regulations to make opioids more readily available. But 14 more importantly, I cite this document as an example of 15 the ways in which opioid distributors such as McKesson 16 and opioid manufacturers such as Janssen have worked in 17 collaboration to promote opioid prescribing, contributing 18 to the oversupply problem. 19 Q. So if a doctor writes a prescription for Nucynta 20 and a patient uses this coupon to reduce his or her 21 co-pay, you see that as a nefarious thing? 22 A. In isolation, not necessarily. But in the 23 broader picture of the conduct of defendants, yes, to me 24 this is worrisome, especially when it seems to me that 25 the various defendants are trying to say that the other</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 260</p> <p>1 I'm going to hand you what's been marked as 2 Exhibit 10 (indicating). I will show you that. 3 So this is the -- I'll represent to you this is 4 the very first label, which is the approval for 5 tapentadol under the tradename Nucynta. In fact, this 6 one doesn't even have the tradename in the label yet, but 7 it is tapentadol. 8 And you'll see the initial US approval was 2008, 9 and that this particular document was revised in November 10 of 2008. 11 Do you see that? 12 A. Where does it say it was revised? Oh, down 13 below. 14 Q. Yes. 15 A. I see that. 16 Q. If you look at the indications of use, again, 17 the trade name is missing in this early label, but is an 18 opioid analgesic indicated for the relief of moderate to 19 severe acute pain in patients 18 years or older. 20 Do you see that? 21 A. I do see that. 22 Q. Okay. So would this indicate at least that 23 there is a version of Nucynta that only has an acute pain 24 indication? 25 A. This would assert that this version of Nucynta</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 259</p> <p>1 one is to blame, when, in fact, they are working with one 2 another. 3 MR. EHSAN: Move to strike that -- the rest of 4 your response after the beginning as nonresponsive. 5 Q. Doctor, do you know what Nucynta's mechanism of 6 action is? 7 A. Yes, I do. 8 Q. What is Nucynta's mechanism of action? 9 A. It's a norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor. 10 Q. And you understand if Nucynta is indicated for 11 acute or chronic pain? 12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to the form. 13 THE WITNESS: Well, when you say is indicated 14 for acute or chronic pain, what are you basing that on? 15 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: You understand drugs come with 16 indications? 17 A. Yes, I do. 18 Q. Do you know that this particular Nucynta coupon, 19 is it for a Nucynta that's indicated for chronic pain? 20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 21 THE WITNESS: I'd like to see the source that 22 Janssen relied upon to promote Nucynta for chronic pain. 23 It was based on what? 24 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Again, I don't think you 25 understood my question so let me try it this way.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 261</p> <p>1 has an acute pain indication. 2 Q. And do you see where the dosage forms and 3 strengths of the tablets are available in 50, 75 and 4 100 milligrams? 5 A. I do see that, yes. 6 Q. Okay. You can put that aside. I'm going to 7 show you one more document here (indicating). This is 8 Exhibit 11. 9 And do you see that this is another coupon 10 where -- that the top states up to ten free pills of 11 Nucynta, 50, 75 or 100 milligram. 12 Do you see that? 13 A. I do see that. 14 Q. And it says, again to the patient, that present 15 your written prescription for Nucynta. 16 Do you see that? 17 A. Present your written prescription for up to ten 18 Nucynta. 19 Q. 50, 75 or 100 milligram tablets; correct? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. These dosages would be consistent -- 22 A. I would just -- I would just add for 23 completeness, this voucher to your pharmacist, give this 24 voucher to your pharmacist to receive your free trial. 25 Q. Again, but it requires a prescription for</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 262</p> <p>1 Nucynta; correct?</p> <p>2 A. (Nods head.)</p> <p>3 Q. And presumably that doctor has made a decision</p> <p>4 that Nucynta is an appropriate medication for acute</p> <p>5 treatment of pain in that patient; correct?</p> <p>6 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>7 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Is that a "yes"?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And that this allows the patient to offset the</p> <p>10 cost of the medication; correct?</p> <p>11 A. It allows for a free trial.</p> <p>12 Q. Would that mean that -- so assume this coupon</p> <p>13 didn't exist. Would you then advocate that the patient</p> <p>14 not take the medication because he or she can't afford</p> <p>15 it?</p> <p>16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I'd really have to know the</p> <p>18 details of the specific case in order to weigh in on that</p> <p>19 question.</p> <p>20 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: So you can't say that it would be</p> <p>21 better for the patient to get the medication he or she</p> <p>22 was prescribed or not be able to afford it? That</p> <p>23 requires more information to make that distinction?</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yes. Because given the prevailing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 264</p> <p>1 A. Where are the dosages forms and strengths?</p> <p>2 Q. So sure. Left-hand column, next-to-last</p> <p>3 segment.</p> <p>4 A. 50, 100, 150, 200, 250. No, it's not available</p> <p>5 in 75.</p> <p>6 Q. So likewise, what I handed you in Exhibit 11</p> <p>7 would be inconsistent with a reference to the long-acting</p> <p>8 version of Nucynta; correct?</p> <p>9 A. Not necessarily because it is available in 50</p> <p>10 and 100.</p> <p>11 Q. So you're suggesting the coupon is referring to</p> <p>12 two different Nycyntas in the same construct? If that's</p> <p>13 your understanding, that's fine. I'm not going to take</p> <p>14 time to debate that issue, but is that your opinion?</p> <p>15 A. Well, it's not -- it's not clear to me which</p> <p>16 Nucynta the coupon is referring to.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Now, Doctor, if you don't mind looking at</p> <p>18 again the very first page of Exhibit 12, do you see there</p> <p>19 is an indication and usage section?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>21 Q. Would you mind reading that, please.</p> <p>22 A. "Nucynta ER is an opioid analgesic indicated for</p> <p>23 the management of moderate to severe chronic pain in</p> <p>24 adults whom continuous around-the-clock opioid analgesic</p> <p>25 is needed for an extended period of time."</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 263</p> <p>1 pattern of opioid prescribing in the last ten years, I</p> <p>2 can't be certain that this patient should actually be</p> <p>3 prescribed an opioid analgesic, even for acute pain.</p> <p>4 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Do you agree that there are</p> <p>5 randomized clinical trials showing efficacy of opioids</p> <p>6 for the treatment of acute pain?</p> <p>7 A. I do. But it doesn't mean that opioids are</p> <p>8 without risk, even in an acute setting. It's all about</p> <p>9 the risk-benefit calculation.</p> <p>10 Q. Understood. We, I think, established that</p> <p>11 there's a risk associated with every prescription.</p> <p>12 I'm going to hand you what's been marked as</p> <p>13 Exhibit 12 (indicating).</p> <p>14 And Doctor, I'll represent to you this is the</p> <p>15 first or approval prescription -- or sorry -- labeling</p> <p>16 for Nucynta ER, which is the long-acting version of</p> <p>17 Nucynta, and it was actually approved in 2011, and that</p> <p>18 by dating purposes, it postdates the April 2010 coupon;</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 This would be Exhibit 9.</p> <p>21 A. April 2010 and 2011, yes, it appears to postdate</p> <p>22 that.</p> <p>23 Q. And likewise, if you look at the dosage forms</p> <p>24 and strengths, it's not available in a 75-milligram</p> <p>25 version, is it?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 265</p> <p>1 Q. Would you agree with me, Doctor, that that</p> <p>2 indication is for the use of Nucynta in the management of</p> <p>3 chronic pain?</p> <p>4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Now, do you agree with this</p> <p>7 indication for Nucynta?</p> <p>8 A. I think this indication is not supported by the</p> <p>9 evidence. I do reference some of the efficacy studies in</p> <p>10 my report. Afilalo, et al., compared Nucynta to placebo</p> <p>11 and I believe oxycodone and found no clinically</p> <p>12 meaningful difference in a 12-week study.</p> <p>13 And as far as I know, there are no studies that</p> <p>14 are placebo-controlled randomized trials longer than</p> <p>15 12 weeks using Nucynta, tapentadol, in the treatment of</p> <p>16 chronic pain.</p> <p>17 So I feel that this indication is not informed</p> <p>18 by the evidence.</p> <p>19 Q. I'll just -- two quick questions, and I realize</p> <p>20 I'm trying to make things quick here, given the timing.</p> <p>21 But the Afilalo study references or comparing</p> <p>22 Nucynta to oxycodone, another active opioid; right?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, and to placebo.</p> <p>24 Q. Could you turn to page 12 of Exhibit 3 that I</p> <p>25 handed you. That's the label for the long-acting</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 266</p> <p>1 Nucynta. You have it, I think.</p> <p>2 A. I have it? Okay, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. If you turn to page 3 of that document. You</p> <p>4 have it.</p> <p>5 Do you see that there is a series of warnings</p> <p>6 surrounded by a box?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>8 Q. Are you familiar with the term "box warning" or</p> <p>9 "black box warning"?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you see in the middle of that black box</p> <p>12 warning related to Nucynta ER, there's a section titled</p> <p>13 "Proper Patient Selection"?</p> <p>14 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>15 Q. Could you please read that.</p> <p>16 A. "Nucynta is an extended-release formulation of</p> <p>17 tapentadol indicated for the management of moderate to</p> <p>18 severe chronic pain in adults when a continuous</p> <p>19 around-the-clock opioid analgesic is needed for an</p> <p>20 extended period of time."</p> <p>21 Q. Do you feel -- you believe that is a false or</p> <p>22 misleading statement?</p> <p>23 A. I feel that this statement is not informed by</p> <p>24 reliable evidence because it takes a study that provides</p> <p>25 weak evidence for efficacy in acute pain and presumably</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 268</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Now, how would a physician know that a patient</p> <p>3 required around-the-clock or continuous opioid analgesic?</p> <p>4 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I guess could you be more specific</p> <p>6 in your question? It seems that the question could</p> <p>7 encompass many different clinical scenarios.</p> <p>8 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Sure. Let me just tell you --</p> <p>9 put it differently.</p> <p>10 Would it be fair to say that in order for</p> <p>11 someone to require around-the-clock opioid analgesic, he</p> <p>12 would qualify for the indication under Nucynta, that he</p> <p>13 or she would have to be on some amount of opioids before</p> <p>14 getting to the Nucynta prescription?</p> <p>15 A. Are you asking me about my opinion regarding the</p> <p>16 use of opioids in the treatment of chronic pain or are</p> <p>17 you asking me about the common practice?</p> <p>18 Q. Dr. Lembke, you said you had 20 years of</p> <p>19 practice or medical practice experience and you relied on</p> <p>20 your other clinical judgement, and I'm just taking it</p> <p>21 from a perspective of a physician who's prescribed</p> <p>22 opioids as well, that you don't start someone with a dose</p> <p>23 of a long-acting, continuous opioid unless you know how</p> <p>24 much opioids they could tolerate, i.e., they should</p> <p>25 probably be on some level of regular short-acting opioids</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 267</p> <p>1 extends that to the treatment of chronic pain.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have an understanding of what studies the</p> <p>3 FDA reviewed in its approval and ultimate decision for</p> <p>4 the indication of Nucynta ER?</p> <p>5 A. I believe that they did base their approval on</p> <p>6 the Afilalo study and I think also the Buynak study in</p> <p>7 2010.</p> <p>8 Q. And you think the totality of the evidence that</p> <p>9 the FDA reviewed in connection with the indication for</p> <p>10 Nucynta ER does not support the indication the FDA</p> <p>11 ultimately granted Janssen for the drug; is that correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I would say that's true.</p> <p>13 Q. Would you think that the FDA was just wrong on</p> <p>14 this issue?</p> <p>15 A. I think the FDA was wrong on this issue, yes.</p> <p>16 But there are other experts who will be opining on the</p> <p>17 FDA and on FDA labeling.</p> <p>18 Q. Focusing your attention on the indication for</p> <p>19 Nucynta ER, it talks about management of moderate to</p> <p>20 severe chronic pain when a continuous around-the-clock</p> <p>21 opioid is needed.</p> <p>22 Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A. This is under "proper patient selection" again?</p> <p>24 Q. No. If you go back to page 1. I apologize for</p> <p>25 not being very clear. Under the "indication" section.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 269</p> <p>1 and you're transitioning them to a long-acting opioid.</p> <p>2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: So I'm not sure that the actual</p> <p>4 practice as it occurs in the United States necessarily</p> <p>5 follows what you just said. I think that patients are</p> <p>6 started on long-acting opioids by some physicians even</p> <p>7 when they've not been on short-acting opioids, so...</p> <p>8 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Understood. And I'm sorry, it</p> <p>9 was suggested that the United States meaning that I don't</p> <p>10 have experience with the practice in the United States or</p> <p>11 are you just saying that you have a different sense of</p> <p>12 where I've come from in terms of my clinical experience</p> <p>13 versus yours? I'm just curious about that.</p> <p>14 A. I know nothing about your clinical experience.</p> <p>15 Q. But you believe in the United States it is not</p> <p>16 standard practice to take a patient first on a</p> <p>17 short-acting opioid, then transition them to a</p> <p>18 long-acting opioid?</p> <p>19 A. I think that practice varies greatly and that we</p> <p>20 are in a situation where many doctors without pain</p> <p>21 expertise, in particular front-line primary care doctors,</p> <p>22 have been put in the position of prescribing opioids</p> <p>23 without really being given proper training on how to do</p> <p>24 that, and so I think practice patterns vary greatly.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you know anything about the specific practice</p>

68 (Pages 266 - 269)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 270</p> <p>1 patterns in New York?</p> <p>2 A. I've commented previously on New York and what I</p> <p>3 have looked at and what I haven't looked at.</p> <p>4 Q. Two -- two more quick questions.</p> <p>5 Doctor, you said you worked with a DEA agent in</p> <p>6 Oakland recently.</p> <p>7 Do you recall that?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Would you be willing to provide that agent's</p> <p>10 name?</p> <p>11 A. I'd be happy to do that.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Can you provide that?</p> <p>13 A. I'd have to look at my records. I --</p> <p>14 MR. EHSAN: Fair point.</p> <p>15 And I'd just ask your counsel that if Dr. Lembke</p> <p>16 could provide that name, that you could provide it to us.</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: If the agent himself or herself</p> <p>18 has no reason to object, then I would have no reason to</p> <p>19 object. And I don't know whether the witness has the</p> <p>20 right to speak for that person.</p> <p>21 If she's willing and the agent that she spoke to</p> <p>22 is willing, then I'm willing.</p> <p>23 MR. EHSAN: Well, I asked her a question. She</p> <p>24 said she was willing.</p> <p>25 MR. ARBITBLIT: And you asked me a question and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 272</p> <p>1 by Janssen or any of its affiliates to the prescribing</p> <p>2 doctor?</p> <p>3 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I believe that Janssen and Janssen</p> <p>5 affiliates' misrepresentation have impacted prescribers</p> <p>6 in New York.</p> <p>7 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: But can you identify a single</p> <p>8 doctor that was misled by Janssen?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, I can identify doctors that I have spoken</p> <p>10 to in New York who said that they were misled by the</p> <p>11 misrepresentations by the opioid pharmaceutical industry,</p> <p>12 including Janssen, but not specifically referring to</p> <p>13 Janssen.</p> <p>14 Q. So none of them specifically mentioned Janssen?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 MR. EHSAN: Thank you, Doctor. I will pass the</p> <p>17 witness.</p> <p>18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the</p> <p>19 time is 4:17 p.m.</p> <p>20 (Recess.)</p> <p>21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, 4:25 p.m.</p> <p>22 EXAMINATION</p> <p>23 Q. BY MS. VICARI: Dr. Lembke, my name is Angela</p> <p>24 Vicari, and I represent the ENDO and Par defendants in</p> <p>25 this case.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 271</p> <p>1 I gave you an answer. She may not have the authority to</p> <p>2 speak for that person.</p> <p>3 MR. EHSAN: Under what --</p> <p>4 MR. ARBITBLIT: I don't know. I'm not saying</p> <p>5 that I won't provide it. You're just making an argument</p> <p>6 that doesn't necessarily have a basis. We may be in</p> <p>7 complete agreement.</p> <p>8 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Then, Dr. Lembke, are you aware</p> <p>9 of any marketing by Janssen that led to any inappropriate</p> <p>10 prescription for Duragesic or Nucynta in the state of New</p> <p>11 York?</p> <p>12 A. So I'm aware of marketing efforts by Janssen and</p> <p>13 lobbying efforts and funding efforts by Janssen on a</p> <p>14 national level that did affect prescribing patterns</p> <p>15 across all the states, including the state of New York.</p> <p>16 Q. Let me be a little more specific.</p> <p>17 Can you identify a single prescription in the</p> <p>18 state of New York for either Duragesic or Nucynta that</p> <p>19 was -- let's just take it sequentially -- that was, one,</p> <p>20 improper?</p> <p>21 A. I'm not --</p> <p>22 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: At that level of specificity, no,</p> <p>24 not a single prescription.</p> <p>25 Q. BY MR. EHSAN: Two, based on a misrepresentation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 273</p> <p>1 Do you know what opioid medication --</p> <p>2 medications ENDO manufactures?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. ENDO manufactures OPANA ER, Percodin,</p> <p>4 Percocet, and generic forms of oxycodone, oxymorphone,</p> <p>5 hydromorphone and hydrocodone.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know what opioid medications Par</p> <p>7 manufactures?</p> <p>8 A. I'm not familiar with the ways in which ENDO and</p> <p>9 Par relate to each other, but it could be that some of</p> <p>10 those are, in fact, manufactured by Par or were</p> <p>11 manufactured by Par before being acquired by ENDO. I'm</p> <p>12 not familiar with the acquisitions process.</p> <p>13 Q. And I noticed in answering that question, you're</p> <p>14 referring to a document. Is that document part of your</p> <p>15 report?</p> <p>16 A. This document is part of the Complaint.</p> <p>17 MS. VICARI: Can we mark that. I'd like to mark</p> <p>18 that as an exhibit in the deposition.</p> <p>19 I'd like to mark that document as Exhibit Number</p> <p>20 13. Oh, it's already marked as 5?</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: It's part of the exhibit that</p> <p>22 counsel asked earlier that we reproduce for you. So it's</p> <p>23 part of Exhibit 5.</p> <p>24 MS. VICARI: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>25 Q. Now, Dr. Lembke, is it your understanding that</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 274</p> <p>1 other experts are offering opinions regarding the</p> <p>2 adequacy of ENDO's suspicious order monitoring systems?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And you're not offering any opinions regarding</p> <p>5 the adequacy of ENDO's suspicious order monitoring</p> <p>6 systems; correct?</p> <p>7 A. I'm not offering specific opinions on ENDO, but</p> <p>8 as stated in my report, I do offer an opinion on the role</p> <p>9 of distributors, manufacturers and pharmacies in creating</p> <p>10 the oversupply that led to the opioid epidemic.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know anything about the way in which ENDO</p> <p>12 monitored suspicious orders?</p> <p>13 A. I know that in general, opioid manufacturers</p> <p>14 look at reports of -- actually, I would -- I would defer</p> <p>15 that to other experts.</p> <p>16 Q. So you're not offering any opinions regarding</p> <p>17 the adequacy of ENDO's suspicious order monitoring</p> <p>18 system; correct?</p> <p>19 A. That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And you're not offering any opinions regarding</p> <p>21 the adequacy of Par's suspicious order monitoring</p> <p>22 systems; correct?</p> <p>23 A. That's correct.</p> <p>24 Q. And you said earlier other experts will be</p> <p>25 opining on FDA issues; is that correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 276</p> <p>1 marketing efforts.</p> <p>2 Q. And a lot of those materials are in your report.</p> <p>3 I was asking which materials that are not in Exhibit B or</p> <p>4 the supplement to your report did you receive from ENDO?</p> <p>5 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: As answered, the materials that</p> <p>7 are cited in my report as well as my clinical experience</p> <p>8 and my experience as a clinician being influenced by the</p> <p>9 marketing material in real time as it unfolded in the</p> <p>10 '90s and early aughts through today have contributed to</p> <p>11 my opinion.</p> <p>12 So I wouldn't want you to be under the mistaken</p> <p>13 conclusion that it's just those listed documents gathered</p> <p>14 for the purpose of writing the report.</p> <p>15 Q. BY MS. VICARI: Do you intend to offer opinions</p> <p>16 at trial regarding ENDO -- any ENDO documents that are</p> <p>17 not included in Exhibit B or the supplement to your</p> <p>18 report?</p> <p>19 A. If there's a document that you'd like me to see</p> <p>20 in addition, I would be happy to review it.</p> <p>21 Q. There's no document that I wish to show you.</p> <p>22 Sitting here today, do you intend to offer any</p> <p>23 opinions at trial concerning any ENDO documents that are</p> <p>24 not included in Exhibit B or the supplement to your</p> <p>25 report?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 275</p> <p>1 A. I do mention the FDA in my report in several</p> <p>2 places. If you'd like, I can go to those sections.</p> <p>3 Q. My -- that's okay.</p> <p>4 You're not offering any opinions regarding</p> <p>5 ENDO's compliance with FDA regulations; correct?</p> <p>6 A. That's correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And you're not offering any opinions regarding</p> <p>8 Par's compliance with FDA regulations; correct?</p> <p>9 A. That is correct.</p> <p>10 Q. Now, Dr. Lembke, all the documents that you</p> <p>11 considered in forming your opinions are set forth in</p> <p>12 Exhibit B to your report and the supplement that was</p> <p>13 provided last night; correct?</p> <p>14 A. That is correct, but I would add to that I was</p> <p>15 the recipient of ENDO and other defendants' marketing</p> <p>16 material throughout my medical career. Those are not --</p> <p>17 those are not listed, but those are part of what has</p> <p>18 contributed to my opinion.</p> <p>19 Q. And what documents that are not listed in</p> <p>20 Exhibit B or the supplement did you receive from ENDO</p> <p>21 during the course of your medical career?</p> <p>22 A. I can't speak to ENDO specifically, but in terms</p> <p>23 of opioid manufacturers and their influence on pain as</p> <p>24 the fifth vital sign on the Federation of State Medical</p> <p>25 Boards on pain guidelines, I was the recipient of those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 277</p> <p>1 A. Not unless I'm asked to review an additional</p> <p>2 document, which I would be happy to do.</p> <p>3 Q. And in forming your opinions as to ENDO in this</p> <p>4 case, you did not consider any deposition testimony given</p> <p>5 by ENDO witnesses; is that correct?</p> <p>6 A. That is correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And in forming your opinions in this case, you</p> <p>8 did not consider any deposition testimony given by any</p> <p>9 Par witnesses; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A. That is correct.</p> <p>11 Q. And it's fair to say that in forming your</p> <p>12 opinions, you didn't review all of ENDO's opioid</p> <p>13 marketing materials; correct?</p> <p>14 A. That is correct.</p> <p>15 Q. To the extent that you considered ENDO documents</p> <p>16 in forming your opinions, you've reviewed those documents</p> <p>17 thoroughly; correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And to the extent that as a result of your</p> <p>20 review of an ENDO document, did you include all of the</p> <p>21 statements that you believe to be misleading in your</p> <p>22 report?</p> <p>23 A. I included representative samples. I didn't</p> <p>24 include all of the misleading documents. There were so</p> <p>25 many that it would have been a very long report to</p>

70 (Pages 274 - 277)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 278</p> <p>1 include all of them, but I included representative 2 examples. 3 Q. Which ENDO documents -- in your opinion, which 4 ENDO documents contained misleading statements that were 5 not included in Exhibit B to your report or the 6 supplement? 7 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: I don't remember now, but when I 9 found a statement that was repetitive of other 10 misrepresentations, I just tried to use several examples, 11 not every single example, because it would have been 12 redundant. 13 Q. BY MS. VICARI: Dr. Lembke, you have not 14 conducted any analyses to determine which, if any, 15 prescriptions of ENDO opioid medications in New York 16 state were medically inappropriate, have you? 17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 18 THE WITNESS: As stated before along similar 19 lines of questioning, I have not analyzed documents at 20 the level of individual documents produced by ENDO in the 21 state of New York. But I would qualify that by saying I 22 believe that prescribers in the state of New York were 23 exposed to the same misleading marketing messages as 24 doctors all across the country. 25 Q. BY MS. VICARI: And same question as to Suffolk</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 280</p> <p>1 prescribing physicians are a window into the campaign 2 that ENDO and other defendants were launching to convince 3 prescribers. 4 I think there were many instances of 5 misrepresentation for which there's documentation at all, 6 and of course, those can't be included. 7 Q. I guess my -- my question was not as to 8 messaging; it was to the particular document. 9 Is it your -- you would agree with me that any 10 ENDO document that was internal only and never seen by a 11 physician, that document could not have been relied on by 12 a physician in making a prescribing decision; correct? 13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 14 THE WITNESS: Well, I disagree with that because 15 an internal ENDO document could easily have influenced 16 the external communications with prescribers and hence 17 influence their prescribing. 18 Q. BY MS. VICARI: Dr. Lembke, can you identify for 19 me any individuals who died as a result of taking an 20 opioid manufactured by either ENDO or Par in either the 21 state of New York, Suffolk County or Nassau County? 22 A. No. 23 Q. And Dr. Lembke, can you identify for me any 24 individuals who overdosed on an opioid manufactured by 25 ENDO or Par in New York state, Suffolk County or Nassau</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 279</p> <p>1 County. Is your answer the same? 2 A. Same answer. 3 Q. And same question as to Nassau County. Is your 4 answer the same? 5 A. Same answer. 6 Q. You have not conducted any analysis to determine 7 when -- whether any particular prescription of an ENDO 8 medication in New York state was influenced by ENDO's 9 marketing; correct? 10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 11 THE WITNESS: I would refer to my answer to the 12 last question, which I think is essentially the same 13 answer. 14 Q. BY MS. VICARI: And same question as to Suffolk. 15 Is your answer -- is your answer the same? 16 A. Yes, it is. 17 Q. Okay. And the same question as to Nassau 18 County. Is your answer the same? 19 A. Yes, it is. 20 Q. Dr. Lembke, would you agree with me that any 21 ENDO document that was an internal-only document, not 22 seen by physicians, could not have been relied on by 23 doctors in New York state in their prescription of an 24 opioid to a patient? 25 A. Well, I think internal documents not seen by a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 281</p> <p>1 County? 2 A. Not at the level of an individual by name. Not 3 at that level. 4 Q. Okay. And if I asked the same question with 5 respect to abuse of an ENDO or Par opioid, is your answer 6 the same? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Okay. And you can't identify for me anyone who 9 misused an ENDO or Par opioid in the state of New York, 10 Suffolk County or Nassau County, can you? 11 A. Not by name, no. 12 Q. And similarly, you can't identify any individual 13 who became addicted to an ENDO or Par opioid in the state 14 of New York, Suffolk County or Nassau County; correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. Now, Dr. Lembke, when you encounter a patient 17 who you learn has abused a prescription opioid, do you 18 report that abuse as an adverse event to the manufacturer 19 of that opioid? 20 A. I have not done that, no. 21 Q. And when you encounter a patient who you know 22 misused a prescription opioid, do you report that as an 23 adverse event to the manufacturer of the opioid? 24 A. I've not taken that action, but I have written 25 and spoken widely on the problem of prescription opioid</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 282</p> <p>1 misuse and addictive use as a way to try to raise 2 awareness. So I have taken other measures to raise 3 awareness. 4 Q. But you haven't submitted an adverse event 5 report to the manufacturer in that case; correct? 6 A. No, I haven't, and that is largely because my 7 awareness of the opioid problem really began after I 8 graduated from medical school and finished my residency 9 training, and at that point, I was not prescribing 10 opioids until I began to prescribe buprenorphine for the 11 treatment of opioid use disorder. 12 Q. Well, when patients come to you for the 13 treatment of opioid use disorder today, you testified 14 earlier some of them are abusing prescription opioids; 15 correct? 16 A. Yes, that is true. 17 Q. And do they tell you which opioid they are 18 abusing? 19 A. Sometimes they do, yes. 20 Q. And when they tell you which opioid and they 21 are, I'll say, misusing, do you report that as an adverse 22 event to the manufacturer of that opioid? 23 A. That has not been my practice. 24 Q. And when you encounter a patient who you know 25 has become addicted to a prescription opioid, do you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 284</p> <p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. How would you design a randomized 3 placebo-controlled trial to determine whether opioid 4 therapy is effective for chronic non-cancer pain? 5 A. Well, I would try to use a real clinic 6 population, not a rarified sample. So I would try to 7 base it in a clinic and recruit patients who were 8 representative of the types of patients we see in real 9 clinical care. 10 I would try, as the SPACE trial did, to assess 11 their impressions of opioids prior to initiating therapy. 12 I would randomize those individuals to 13 comparable groups, one group to receive opioids and 14 another to receive placebo in a blinded -- double-blinded 15 fashion, so neither the providers -- prescribers or 16 patients themselves knew which they were getting. 17 Q. Uh-huh. 18 A. And then I would try to use comprehensive 19 measures that are clinically meaningful to assess their 20 subjective pain relief but also their objective function 21 and many other potential adverse health consequences, 22 including the risk of misuse and addictive use. That's 23 just a start. 24 Q. You mentioned the SPACE trial. Do you believe 25 that there was any selection bias in the SPACE trial?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 283</p> <p>1 report that case of addiction to the manufacturer of the 2 opioid as an adverse event report? 3 A. I don't report it as an adverse event report to 4 the manufacturer, but I certainly do alert the other 5 healthcare providers taking care of that patient. I 6 alert in some instances the pharmacist who's dispensing 7 for that patient. 8 Q. And do you report any known diversion of a 9 prescription opioid to the manufacturer as an adverse 10 event? 11 A. As stated before, it's very hard for me to be 12 aware of diversion in real time because patients will not 13 admit to it. It's only in the past tense that they'll 14 admit to it. I've had instances of being suspicious of 15 diversion, but not enough to, let's say, involve criminal 16 justice or report it at that level. 17 Q. Now, Dr. Lembke, it's your position and your 18 opinion in this case that there's no reliable scientific 19 evidence showing that the long -- that long-term opioid 20 therapy is effective for chronic non-cancer pain; is that 21 correct? 22 A. Yes, that's correct. 23 Q. And by "reliable scientific evidence," you mean 24 a randomized placebo-controlled trial in excess of three 25 months; is that correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 285</p> <p>1 A. So the SPACE trial itself said that there was 2 some bias in favor of opioids a priori. 3 Q. Is that the only bias that you're aware of in 4 the SPACE trial? 5 A. Well, the SPACE trial used an opioid-naïve 6 sample. That's not a bias, but there are lots of 7 patients who are already on opioids that should also be 8 counted. 9 And, of course, you know, 12 months, although a 10 long time compared to most studies, is still probably not 11 sufficient to assess the true risk of opioid addiction. 12 When patients are receiving prescription for an opioid in 13 clinical care, there are data showing that median length 14 of time to developing an opioid addiction is 15 approximately three years. 16 MS. VICARI: Thank you, Dr. Lembke, for your 17 time. I'll pass the witness. 18 Can we go off the record while we pass the 19 witness. 20 MR. ARBITBLIT: Yes, thanks for asking. 21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the 22 time is 4:42 p.m. 23 (Discussion off the record.) 24 (Exhibit 13, ALLERGAN_MDL_01361692 - 1850, 25 marked for identification.)</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 286</p> <p>1 (Exhibit 14, WIS_PPSG_003892, marked for 2 identification.) 3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time 4 is 4:45 p.m. 5 EXAMINATION 6 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Good afternoon, Dr. Lembke. 7 A. Good afternoon. 8 Q. My name is Maria Rivera. I'm from the law firm 9 of Kirkland & Ellis, and I represent Allergan Finance, 10 LLC, in this case. 11 If you wouldn't mind in Exhibit 2, which is your 12 report, turning to Appendix B, which is your relied upon 13 list. 14 And if you would turn to page 49 of that relied 15 upon list, please. 16 A. 49 of the relied upon list. Yes, I'm there. 17 Q. Yes, ma'am. 18 Am I correct that this is where you list the 19 document -- or the defendant-specific documents that you 20 reviewed and relied upon in reaching your opinions in 21 this case? 22 A. Yes, this is the documents that I relied upon. 23 Q. Okay. And am I correct that there are six 24 Allergan-produced documents on that list? 25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 288</p> <p>1 A. No. 2 Q. Now you, as was mentioned, did serve a report in 3 the MDL case as well. 4 Do you recall that? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Okay. And I'll represent to you that in that 7 case, you listed only five Allergan Bates-labeled 8 documents. And the document that you added is number 667 9 in your New York report, and I'm going to hand that to 10 you, which has been marked Exhibit 13 (indicating.) 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Thank you, Counsel. 12 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: And let me just back up and ask 13 you one question. 14 Were the six Allergan-produced documents that 15 you reviewed provided to you by your counsel? 16 A. Yes, they were. 17 Q. Okay. And do you have an understanding that 18 Allergan has produced hundreds of thousands of documents 19 in this case; correct? 20 A. That is correct. 21 Q. But you didn't think it was necessary to review 22 any more Allergan documents that the six that are listed 23 in your report; is that correct? 24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 25 THE WITNESS: I lived through this promotional</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 287</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that those are the 2 only Allergan-specific documents that you reviewed to 3 reach any Allergan-specific opinions in your report? 4 A. No, because I was the recipient of multiple 5 Allergan promotional material throughout my medical 6 career. So that is also part of what forms the basis of 7 my opinion. 8 Q. Okay. Can you identify any specific Allergan 9 promotional material that you received during your career 10 that you're relying upon for purposes of your opinions in 11 this case? 12 A. I do have some memories of Allergan promotional 13 material for Actiq or fentanyl lollipops through my 14 medical training because I remember being so shocked that 15 fentanyl would be put in lollypop form. 16 Q. And is it your understanding that those are 17 Allergan products? 18 A. Oh, sorry. Those are Teva products. You're 19 right. Sorry. 20 Q. Okay. So let me ask my question again. 21 Do you have or can you identify any other 22 Allergan-specific documents or materials that you're 23 relying upon for your opinions in this case with respect 24 to Allergan, other than the six documents that are listed 25 in Appendix B to your report?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 289</p> <p>1 campaign, and the Allergan documents that I reviewed were 2 consistent with my lived experience of pharmaceuticals' 3 promotional messages. So because those themes were 4 saturated, no, I didn't think it was necessary. But if 5 there are any documents that you would like me to review, 6 I would be happy to review them. 7 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Okay. But the answer to my 8 question about whether you didn't think it was necessary 9 to review any more Allergan documents that the ones that 10 are listed in Appendix B is "yes"; correct? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form, asked and 12 answered. 13 THE WITNESS: I did answer that question. 14 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Okay. The document that I 15 handed you, which is Exhibit 13, is the one that you 16 added to your report. 17 In looking at this document, which is entitled 18 "ER/LA Opioid REMS," do you see that this document was 19 created by The Collaboration For REMS Education? 20 A. Yes, I do. 21 Q. Okay. So in looking at this document, would you 22 agree with me that is not a document that Allergan 23 created? 24 A. I can't be sure of that. I'm not sure what The 25 Collaborative For REMS Education consists.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 290</p> <p>1 Q. Are you able to tell whether any statements in 2 this presentation are attributable to Allergan? 3 A. This presentation, as I'm recalling it, is a 4 more general presentation on opioids, and I don't believe 5 it lists any specific opioid products, although I may be 6 wrong about that. 7 Q. Okay. From looking at this presentation, 8 though, you can't say that any of the statements in here 9 are attributable to Allergan; correct? 10 A. Well, what I would say is that the promotional 11 efforts of Allergan more broadly have contributed to the 12 kinds of statements that are in these educational 13 materials that have contributed to a prescribing pattern 14 which is not consistent with the evidence. 15 Q. Okay. I understand, Dr. Lembke. 16 My question was: This document doesn't have any 17 indication if the statements in it were made by Allergan 18 or not? 19 A. Well, again, what I'm trying to -- to say is to 20 draw a distinction between specific products and the 21 paradigm shift or the cultural change in medicine around 22 opioid prescribing, which I do believe Allergan and other 23 defendants had a hand in. 24 Q. I understand, but that wasn't my question. 25 My question is: You can't tell from this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 292</p> <p>1 Allergan, can I assume that you didn't rely upon this 2 presentation in reaching your Allergan-specific opinions? 3 A. No, that's not correct. 4 Q. Okay. But you can't tell me, sitting here 5 today, how you relied upon this with respect to Allergan? 6 A. So I relied upon this as an example of 7 educational materials disseminated to healthcare 8 providers that misrepresents the evidence around opioid 9 prescribing, and I detail in many places in my report how 10 opioid manufacturers, distributors and pharmacies 11 contributed to this misrepresentation of the evidence and 12 the oversupply that's the essence of my report. 13 Q. Okay. Let's move on. 14 You testified earlier, I believe, that you did 15 not conduct any type of regression analysis. I'll try to 16 get the language right. 17 You did not conduct any type of regression 18 analysis to isolate the impact that any opioid -- opioid 19 marketing by any individual defendant had on New York 20 prescribers; is that correct? 21 A. That is correct. 22 Q. Okay. Am I correct that you didn't do any type 23 of analysis, regression or otherwise, to isolate the 24 impact that any opioid marketing by any individual 25 defendant had on the prescription levels of opioids in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 291</p> <p>1 presentation whether any of the statements in it were 2 made by Allergan or written by Allergan? 3 A. Well, many of the references on many of these 4 slides involve organizations that received funding from 5 opioid Pharma so that it is possible that some of these 6 slides were influenced by Allergan. So I wouldn't want 7 to say for sure. 8 Q. It's possible, but you don't know if that's the 9 case; correct? 10 A. Well, I wouldn't want to say that Allergan 11 didn't influence the content. I believe that Allergan 12 and other opioid manufacturers did greatly influence the 13 content of these kinds of learning materials. 14 Q. Okay. Can I ask you how -- why you added this 15 to your relied upon list from your MDL report to your New 16 York report? 17 I can represent to you that it's not cited 18 anywhere in the body of your report or in your appendix 19 with respect to Allergan. 20 A. Okay. 21 Q. In fact, let me withdraw my question and ask you 22 a different one. 23 A. Okay. 24 Q. If this presentation is not listed anywhere in 25 your report or in your appendix that's specific to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 293</p> <p>1 New York? 2 A. So I read the analyses of others on specific New 3 York prescribing, and those are in my report, and I've 4 cited those in testimony. But I did not do my own 5 individual crunching of numbers, as it were. 6 Q. Okay. 7 A. I have done lots of qualitative analyses that I 8 do think apply to the State of New York and Suffolk and 9 Nassau counties. 10 Q. Understood. And that would mean that you 11 haven't done any independent analysis to try to determine 12 the impact of Allergan-specific promotional activity on 13 the levels of prescribing in Northern California or in 14 Suffolk County or in Nassau; correct? 15 A. Incorrect. I believe that I have done my own 16 independent analyses, as evidenced by peer-reviewed 17 articles I've written, as evidenced by my book, that very 18 carefully details the role of opioid manufacturers -- 19 Allergan is one example -- in creating the 20 overprescribing and oversupply of opioids leading to the 21 opioid epidemic. 22 That is an analysis that I did, a causal 23 analysis. 24 Q. Okay. Have you done -- am I correct that you 25 have not done any quantitative analysis in order to</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 294</p> <p>1 quantify how, if at all, Allergan's promotion contributed 2 to the level of opioid prescribing in New York? 3 A. I would respectfully disagree with that. I've 4 published a paper on which prescribers are prescribing 5 the most opioids, using a national database, Medicare 6 database, including prescribers in the state of New York. 7 And that is a quantitative analysis. 8 Q. Have you done any -- do you have an opinion and 9 are you offering an opinion about the quantitative impact 10 that Allergan's opioid marketing had on prescription 11 levels in New York? 12 A. I'm not quantifying Allergan's role, but I am 13 offering an opinion that Allergan contributed to 14 increased prescribing in the state of New York. 15 Q. Okay. But you haven't done any analysis to 16 quantify what that impact was? 17 A. Well, I have done a quantitative analysis in the 18 article that I published in JAMA looking at who is 19 prescribing opioids, and what we saw was no geographic 20 variation in that pattern across 50 states. 21 And I've also, as I said, done a qualitative 22 analysis which I believe represents the same problems in 23 New York as everywhere else in the country. 24 Q. Am I correct, Doctor, that you don't know how 25 many details Allergan sales reps conducted in New York?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 296</p> <p>1 not at the level of specificity of naming specific opioid 2 manufacturers. 3 Q. Can you identify a specific individual who died 4 or overdosed in New York as a result of taking an 5 Allergan opioid? 6 A. Same -- same answer as the last question. 7 Q. Can you answer it for me more specifically to 8 this question? Can you identify a specific individual 9 who died or overdosed in New York, Suffolk County or 10 Nassau County, as a result of taking an Allergan opioid? 11 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 12 THE WITNESS: Not by name. 13 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Can you identify any individual 14 in New York who became addicted to any opioid or misused 15 any opioid as a result of taking an Allergan opioid 16 product in New York? 17 A. Not by name. 18 Q. Can you identify any individual description in 19 New York, Suffolk County or Nassau County, of an Allergan 20 opioid that was medically inappropriate? 21 A. Not by name. 22 Q. Just a few more questions. 23 Based on your experience, Doctor, would you 24 agree that sometimes manufacturers will detail physicians 25 for the specific purpose of trying to promote</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 295</p> <p>1 A. That is correct. 2 Q. And you don't know how the number of Allergan 3 details compares to any other defendants? 4 A. That is correct. 5 Q. And you don't know how many prescriptions of 6 Allergan's opioid products there were in New York? 7 A. That is correct. 8 Q. And you don't know what Allergan's market share 9 of opioid prescriptions was in New York; is that right? 10 A. That is correct. 11 Q. And am I correct that you cannot name any 12 individual doctor in New York that wrote a prescription 13 for an Allergan opioid that they would not have otherwise 14 written because of Allergan's promotional marketing? 15 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 16 THE WITNESS: Again, my prior answer regarding 17 the overall influence of the opioid industry on 18 overprescribing of opioids does apply to New York as 19 well. 20 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: But you cannot identify a 21 specific doctor in New York that wrote a prescription as 22 a result of Allergan's promotional activity; correct? 23 A. I have spoken to doctors who practice in New 24 York who communicated to me that they were influenced by 25 the misleading of the opioid pharmaceutical industry, but</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 297</p> <p>1 substitution of one opioid for another opioid? 2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 3 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase your question? 4 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Sure. 5 In other words, are you familiar that -- with 6 the fact that manufacturers may detail physicians in 7 order to try to convince them to switch from one opioid 8 to another opioid? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Okay. And if that detailing is successful and 11 the doctor switches from one opioid to another opioid, 12 that is not increase in the overall level of opioid 13 prescriptions, is it? 14 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form. 15 THE WITNESS: It really depends on whether or 16 not that switch, which is most commonly done to try to 17 overcome tolerance, actually leads to an increase in the 18 total of morphine milligram equivalence of that opioid, 19 which is one way to measure increase in supply. 20 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Okay. And if it doesn't lead to 21 an increase in the total morphine milligrams and it's 22 just switching the same level of milligrams from one 23 opioid to another, that does not increase the overall 24 level of opioid prescriptions, does it? 25 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 298</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Well, it might do if it leads to</p> <p>2 more prolonged exposure to that opioid as a result of the</p> <p>3 switch. So not only had the last three decades been</p> <p>4 characterized by increasing doses of opioids, but also</p> <p>5 increasing duration. More than 80 percent of individuals</p> <p>6 receiving opioid therapy are on long-term opioid therapy</p> <p>7 despite the absence of evidence for long-term use.</p> <p>8 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Okay. Let me hand you what's</p> <p>9 been marked as Exhibit 14 very quickly (indicating).</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Copy, please.</p> <p>11 MS. RIVERA: Oh, sorry.</p> <p>12 Q. In your Appendix 2, you identify some documents</p> <p>13 that you believe support that manufacturers supported the</p> <p>14 Wisconsin Pain and Policy Study Group?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And I'll represent to you that the</p> <p>17 document that you cited with respect to Allergan and</p> <p>18 Actavis is the document that I just handed you as</p> <p>19 Exhibit 14.</p> <p>20 And you can see that -- sorry, on page 5 of your</p> <p>21 Appendix 2, paragraph 22 also page 5 of the Pain and</p> <p>22 Policy Study Group appendix?</p> <p>23 A. Yep.</p> <p>24 Q. Paragraph 22?</p> <p>25 A. Yep.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 300</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Three more quick questions.</p> <p>2 Can you identify any payments to a KOL by</p> <p>3 Allergan?</p> <p>4 A. Well, this \$50,000, if I could verify that,</p> <p>5 would serve.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Other than that. And that's not a KOL;</p> <p>7 right?</p> <p>8 A. Well, it's founded and led by Dahl and Joranson,</p> <p>9 who are definitely KOLs.</p> <p>10 Q. Let me try it again.</p> <p>11 If you look at pages 19 to 22 of your report</p> <p>12 where you discuss KOLs that are sponsored by</p> <p>13 manufacturers --</p> <p>14 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>15 Q. -- you don't see any reference to Allergan</p> <p>16 there, do you?</p> <p>17 A. No. I'm not seeing any other reference.</p> <p>18 MS. RIVERA: Okay. That's all I have. Pass the</p> <p>19 witness.</p> <p>20 Off the record, yes, please.</p> <p>21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the</p> <p>22 time is 5:07 p.m.</p> <p>23 (Discussion off the record.)</p> <p>24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time</p> <p>25 is 5:09 p.m.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 299</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And so this is the document that you</p> <p>2 cited to support that Allergan or Actavis had supported</p> <p>3 that Pain and Policy Group. I'll represent to you that</p> <p>4 there is no mention of Allergan or Actavis in this</p> <p>5 document.</p> <p>6 If that's the case, do you have any other</p> <p>7 evidence that you're aware of that would suggest that</p> <p>8 Allergan or Actavis supported the Wisconsin Pain and</p> <p>9 Policy Group, that's not cited in your appendix?</p> <p>10 A. If I cited it in the appendix I would -- and</p> <p>11 it's not appearing in this document, I would really want</p> <p>12 to go back and see what I was referring to.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. As you sit here today, though, you don't</p> <p>14 have any other evidence that Allergan supported the Pain</p> <p>15 and Policy Group; correct?</p> <p>16 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: So I am not intimately familiar</p> <p>18 with the various Allergan subsidiaries or predecessors.</p> <p>19 So I wouldn't want to make that kind of global statement</p> <p>20 without double-checking the source and also verify that</p> <p>21 there's not some subsidiary that did contribute.</p> <p>22 Q. BY MS. RIVERA: Okay. But as you sit here</p> <p>23 today, you don't have any other evidence that you can</p> <p>24 point to; correct?</p> <p>25 A. Not right now.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 301</p> <p>1 EXAMINATION</p> <p>2 Q. BY MS. LEIBELL: Good afternoon, Dr. Lembke. My</p> <p>3 name is Martha Leibell and I represent Teva</p> <p>4 Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Cephalon, Inc., Actavis, LLC,</p> <p>5 Actavis Pharma, Inc., and Watson Laboratories, Inc., in</p> <p>6 the current litigation.</p> <p>7 Can you tell me what medicines Actavis, LLC</p> <p>8 manufactures or sells?</p> <p>9 A. Yes. Is Actavis a subsidiary of Teva?</p> <p>10 Q. It is a separate entity. I'm asking only about</p> <p>11 Actavis, LLC.</p> <p>12 A. I believe that all of the opioid manufacturers,</p> <p>13 the defendants in this litigation, have manufactured some</p> <p>14 form, either branded or generic hydrocodone and</p> <p>15 oxycodone.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And is it the same answer for Actavis</p> <p>17 Pharma, Inc.?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, same answer for Actavis Pharma, Inc.</p> <p>19 Q. And same question for Watson Laboratories, Inc.?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>21 Q. Did you review any package inserts or labels for</p> <p>22 any of the medicines those three entities manufacture or</p> <p>23 sell?</p> <p>24 A. In my career, I have reviewed package inserts</p> <p>25 for many different opioids, and I'm sure that has</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 302</p> <p>1 included products that your defendant client sells.</p> <p>2 Q. For purposes of preparing for the instant</p> <p>3 litigation, have you reviewed any package inserts for any</p> <p>4 drugs manufactured or sold by those three entities?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. In Appendix 1 to your report, you do not</p> <p>7 identify any promotional materials published by Actavis,</p> <p>8 LLC, Actavis Pharma, Inc., or Watson Laboratories, Inc.;</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. Are you aware that these three entities</p> <p>12 manufacture and/or sell generic opioid medicines?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Are you aware that generic opioid medicines are</p> <p>15 not marketed or promoted other than informing the public</p> <p>16 of availability and pricing?</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I'm aware of that, but I would add</p> <p>19 that marketing for branded products influenced the</p> <p>20 prescribing and supply of generic products, and in that</p> <p>21 sense, the result is effectively the same for branded and</p> <p>22 generic products.</p> <p>23 Q. BY MS. LEIBELL: Are you aware of a single</p> <p>24 person in Nassau County that was harmed as a result of a</p> <p>25 medically inappropriate generic opioid prescription</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 304</p> <p>1 A. Oh. Yes, I do know what that is.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. I have not heard it referred to as a TIRF</p> <p>4 medicine.</p> <p>5 Q. Are you aware that they are both -- Actiq and</p> <p>6 Fentora are both short-acting opioids indicated for</p> <p>7 breakthrough cancer pain in opioid-tolerant patients?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, I'm aware of that, but I will say that in</p> <p>9 my clinical experience, I've seen many patients who don't</p> <p>10 fit that description, who have been on Actiq and Fentora.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you yourself ever prescribed a TIRF</p> <p>12 medicine?</p> <p>13 A. I don't recall doing so, but I may have done</p> <p>14 very early in my career when I was still in training. I</p> <p>15 certainly have not done so in the last 20 years.</p> <p>16 I have, however, treated many patients who have</p> <p>17 been on Actiq and Fentora. As I stated previously in the</p> <p>18 deposition, I was shocked to see patients coming into my</p> <p>19 office sucking on fentanyl lollipops.</p> <p>20 Q. Have you ever prescribed a medication for</p> <p>21 off-label use?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know what the TIRF REMS program is?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>25 Q. Can you tell me what that stands for?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 303</p> <p>1 manufactured or sold by these three entities?</p> <p>2 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Not by name.</p> <p>4 Q. BY MS. LEIBELL: Same question for Suffolk</p> <p>5 County.</p> <p>6 A. Not by name. And I would also refer you back to</p> <p>7 my answer to similar questions from other defendants just</p> <p>8 regarding the overall influence of opioid manufacturers,</p> <p>9 distributors and pharmacies in increasing the supply,</p> <p>10 which also apply to these questions here.</p> <p>11 Q. Thank you. I was paying close attention all</p> <p>12 day, but I am asking questions specifically about my</p> <p>13 clients.</p> <p>14 And are you aware of a single person in New York</p> <p>15 state that was harmed as a result of a medically</p> <p>16 inappropriate generic opioid prescription manufactured or</p> <p>17 sold by the three entities I mentioned?</p> <p>18 A. Not by name.</p> <p>19 Q. Are you aware that Actiq and Fentora are TIRF</p> <p>20 medicines?</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I don't know what a TIRF medicine</p> <p>23 is.</p> <p>24 Q. BY MS. LEIBELL: Well, I can represent that that</p> <p>25 stands for transmucosal immediate-release fentanyl.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 305</p> <p>1 A. Well, REMS stands for Risk Evaluation and</p> <p>2 Mitigation Strategy. And again, I've not heard this term</p> <p>3 TIRF before, but transmucosal immediate-release</p> <p>4 medications are associated with a very specific REMS in</p> <p>5 order to -- that doctors are required to take as part of</p> <p>6 their responsibility before they prescribe or as they are</p> <p>7 prescribing these opioids.</p> <p>8 Q. And are you aware that the TIRF REMS program was</p> <p>9 implemented in March 2012?</p> <p>10 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I'm not recalling the specific</p> <p>12 date, but that sounds about right.</p> <p>13 Q. BY MS. LEIBELL: And are you aware that the TIRF</p> <p>14 REMS program requires an FDA-approved medication guide to</p> <p>15 be provided to patients before the medication is</p> <p>16 dispensed in an outpatient setting?</p> <p>17 A. Can you repeat the question?</p> <p>18 Q. Sure.</p> <p>19 Are you aware that the TIRF REMS program</p> <p>20 requires an FDA-approved medication guide to be provided</p> <p>21 to patients before the medicine is dispensed in an</p> <p>22 outpatient setting?</p> <p>23 A. I didn't remember that, but I believe you.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you know whether or not medication guides</p> <p>25 usually contain product labels?</p>


HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 306</p> <p>1 A. I would really want to see the specific 2 medication guide before I could comment on that. I can 3 say that I have reviewed the REMS. I've personally 4 reviewed the REMS for transmucosal immediate-release 5 medications, and I think they're inadequate in order to 6 properly educate doctors about the risks and benefits of 7 opioids.</p> <p>8 Q. In what respect are they inadequate?</p> <p>9 A. I think they perpetrate many of the misleading 10 messages along the lines of opioids being a safe and 11 effective treatment for chronic pain and that the risk is 12 relatively low.</p> <p>13 They also spend very little time in general 14 educating prescribers on addiction, what it is, how to 15 screen and intervene, how to monitor patients. The 16 majority of the time is spent on how to initiate opioids, 17 how to maintain opioids, how to switch from one opioid to 18 another.</p> <p>19 Q. Are you aware that prescribers are required to 20 certify that they understand the risks of abuse, 21 potential harm from these opioids?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I am. But I don't think that that has made 23 much inroads in mitigating those risks. I am familiar 24 with cases of individuals who engaged in a -- physicians 25 who engaged in egregious overprescribing, who documented</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 308</p> <p>1 A. That is correct.</p> <p>2 Q. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA is not one of those 3 defendants; correct?</p> <p>4 A. It is not listed in Appendix 1, that is correct.</p> <p>5 Q. Cephalon, Inc., is not one of those defendants 6 listed in Appendix 1; correct?</p> <p>7 A. That is correct; however, I do refer to 8 Cephalon, Inc., in my report when I discuss the influence 9 of the opioid pharmaceutical industry. I'm happy to turn 10 to that.</p> <p>11 Q. That's okay. Would you identify -- can you tell 12 me --</p> <p>13 A. Please do look at that, though, when you have a 14 moment because I would like that to be part of my -- my 15 response. And I understand you don't have much time.</p> <p>16 Q. I have reviewed it.</p> <p>17 A. Great.</p> <p>18 Q. Have you identified any allegedly misleading 19 promotional messages that were published by Cephalon, 20 Inc., or Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., in preparation 21 for this litigation?</p> <p>22 A. So I have reviewed the way that Cephalon, Inc., 23 promoted guidelines and professional organizations --</p> <p>24 Q. I'm asking a very specific question about 25 materials published by those two entities.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 307</p> <p>1 that they took these REMS, but clearly their practice was 2 not informed by safe opioid prescribing.</p> <p>3 Q. Are you aware that patients also must certify 4 that they've received medication guides from their 5 prescribers before they can be dispensed these 6 medications?</p> <p>7 A. I don't remember that, but I believe you.</p> <p>8 Q. And are you aware that the patient form 9 component requires each patient prescriber to agree that 10 they each understand the risks, consequences, and 11 approved uses of TIRF medicines?</p> <p>12 A. Thank you for telling me that. That's good to 13 know. I would highlight, though, a paper that just came 14 out in the last month by Hayward, et al., which looked at 15 the --</p> <p>16 Q. I'm so sorry to stop you just because I'm very 17 short on time.</p> <p>18 A. Yes. Specifically that paper says that -- that 19 REMS is not showing that it's having an impact.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. I will turn to my next few final 21 questions.</p> <p>22 In Appendix 1 to your report, you list 23 promotional messages that you identify as misleading and 24 identify certain defendants' promotional messages; 25 correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 309</p> <p>1 A. Have I reviewed --</p> <p>2 Q. Yes.</p> <p>3 A. -- promotional materials published by those two 4 entities; is that what you're asking me?</p> <p>5 Q. Correct. In furtherance of this litigation.</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any prescriber in Nassau 8 County who since 2012 was not aware of the risks and 9 indications of Actiq or Fentora before he or she wrote an 10 Actiq or Fentora prescription?</p> <p>11 A. Not by name, but generally, I am aware of 12 prescribers in the state of New York who were influenced 13 by the misleading messaging of opioid manufacturers 14 regarding -- and including fentanyl lollipops.</p> <p>15 Q. Same question for Suffolk County and New York 16 State?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, same answer.</p> <p>18 Q. Are you aware of a single person in New York 19 State, Suffolk County, or Nassau County that was harmed 20 as a result of a medically inappropriate Actiq or Fentora 21 prescription?</p> <p>22 A. Not by name.</p> <p>23 MS. LEIBELL: Thank you, Dr. Lembke.</p> <p>24 Off the record.</p> <p>25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the record, the</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 310</p> <p>1 time is 5:20 p.m.</p> <p>2 (Discussion off the record.)</p> <p>3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record, the time</p> <p>4 is 5:21 p.m.</p> <p>5 EXAMINATION</p> <p>6 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: Good afternoon, Dr. Lembke. My</p> <p>7 name is Megan Rodgers. I'm with the firm Covington &</p> <p>8 Burling, and I represent McKesson. I have just a few</p> <p>9 questions for you today.</p> <p>10 Do you agree that in the treatment of pain, true</p> <p>11 addiction is uncommon?</p> <p>12 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by "true</p> <p>14 addiction"?</p> <p>15 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: What do you understand that</p> <p>16 phrase to mean?</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Well, I'm wondering why you</p> <p>19 qualify it with the word "true."</p> <p>20 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: Let me ask it a slightly</p> <p>21 different way.</p> <p>22 Do you agree that in the treatment of pain,</p> <p>23 addiction is uncommon?</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I disagree.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 312</p> <p>1 Would you ever advise one of your clients that</p> <p>2 they should not be reluctant to seek pain relief because</p> <p>3 of the fear of addiction?</p> <p>4 A. Oh, I see. I had misunderstood that previously.</p> <p>5 No, I would not advise that. I would not advise</p> <p>6 that. I would say that the risk of addiction is very</p> <p>7 appropriate and necessary when it comes to taking</p> <p>8 opioids, even in the context of treatment for a medical</p> <p>9 condition.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you think it's a misleading statement to say</p> <p>11 that individuals should not be reluctant to seek pain</p> <p>12 relief because of the fear of addiction?</p> <p>13 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: It's a confusing phraseology, but</p> <p>15 to the extent that I think I understand what you're</p> <p>16 saying, I would agree that it is a misleading statement.</p> <p>17 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: Is that the kind of statement</p> <p>18 that could result in overprescribing of opioids?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you agree that pain should be considered a</p> <p>21 fifth vital sign?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Is it a misleading statement to say that pain</p> <p>24 should be a considered a fifth vital sign?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 311</p> <p>1 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: Is that a misleading statement?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3 Q. Is that the kind of statement that could result</p> <p>4 in overprescribing of opioid analgesics?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you agree that individuals should not be</p> <p>7 reluctant to seek pain relief because of the fear of</p> <p>8 addiction?</p> <p>9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to the form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Not -- can you rephrase that?</p> <p>11 Sorry, end of the day, and it sort of has a double</p> <p>12 negative in it.</p> <p>13 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: Sure.</p> <p>14 Do you agree that individuals should not be</p> <p>15 reluctant to seek pain relief because of the fear of</p> <p>16 addiction?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Is it a misleading statement to say that</p> <p>19 individuals should not be reluctant to seek pain relief</p> <p>20 because of the fear of addiction?</p> <p>21 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I'm having a little trouble</p> <p>23 with -- I realize I'm having a little bit of trouble</p> <p>24 tracking that statement. Can you rephrase it?</p> <p>25 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: Let me ask it again.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 313</p> <p>1 Q. And is that the kind of statement that could</p> <p>2 result in overprescribing of opioid analgesics?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Last few questions.</p> <p>5 Do you agree that tolerance and physical</p> <p>6 dependency may be pharmacological effects of sustained</p> <p>7 use of opioid analgesics and are not synonymous with</p> <p>8 addiction?</p> <p>9 MR. ARBITBLIT: Object to form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: As currently defined, I would</p> <p>11 agree with that statement, but whether neurobiologically</p> <p>12 those are distinct phenomenon I think is uncertain. They</p> <p>13 are certainly neurobiologically related and also</p> <p>14 phenomenologically related.</p> <p>15 Q. BY MS. RODGERS: Is that the kind of statement,</p> <p>16 and I'll repeat it: Tolerance and physical dependency</p> <p>17 may be pharmacological effects of sustained use of opioid</p> <p>18 analgesics and are not synonymous with addiction. Is</p> <p>19 that the kind of statement that could result in</p> <p>20 overprescribing of opioid analgesics?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 MS. RODGERS: Thank you. I have no further</p> <p>23 questions.</p> <p>24 MR. ARBITBLIT: All right. So before we go off</p> <p>25 the record, we have one little item that we want to</p>

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 314	Page 316																																							
<p>1 potentially correct having to do with the document</p> <p>2 produced natively as I believe, what was it, Exhibit 13,</p> <p>3 that was not the same document that was referenced in the</p> <p>4 expert's report, which does, in fact, mention funding</p> <p>5 from Allergan.</p> <p>6 And so to the extent that the document was not</p> <p>7 the same as the one that the witness referenced, we would</p> <p>8 move to strike the testimony based upon that document.</p> <p>9 And we have no -- it's Exhibit 14. We have no</p> <p>10 questions of the witness, but we reserve our right to</p> <p>11 strike that testimony based on the wrong document.</p> <p>12 MR. CARTER: Doctor, are you going to read and</p> <p>13 sign?</p> <p>14 MR. ARBITBLIT: What's the practice?</p> <p>15 MR. CARTER: I'm asking her if she's going to</p> <p>16 read and sign.</p> <p>17 MR. ARBITBLIT: Well, we'll take it up. We're</p> <p>18 off the record.</p> <p>19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes today's</p> <p>20 videotaped deposition of Dr. Anna Lembke. We're off the</p> <p>21 record at 5:27 p.m.</p> <p>22 Thank you.</p> <p>23 (Time noted: 5:27 p.m.)</p> <p>24 --oOo--</p> <p>25</p>	<p>1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss:</p> <p>2 COUNTY OF MARIN)</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 I, LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR NO. 3462, do</p> <p>5 hereby certify:</p> <p>6 That the foregoing deposition testimony was</p> <p>7 taken before me at the time and place therein set forth</p> <p>8 and at which time the witness was administered the oath;</p> <p>9 That testimony of the witness and all objections</p> <p>10 made by counsel at the time of the examination were</p> <p>11 recorded stenographically by me, and were thereafter</p> <p>12 transcribed under my direction and supervision, and that</p> <p>13 the foregoing pages contain a full, true and accurate</p> <p>14 record of all proceedings and testimony to the best of my</p> <p>15 skill and ability.</p> <p>16 I further certify that I am neither counsel for</p> <p>17 any party to said action, nor am I related to any party</p> <p>18 to said action, nor am I in any way interested in the</p> <p>19 outcome thereof.</p> <p>20 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name</p> <p>21 this 20th day of January, 2020.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 </p> <p>24</p> <p>25 LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR NO. 3462</p>																																							
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 315</p> <p>1 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT</p> <p>2 I, ANNA LEMBKE, M.D., do hereby certify</p> <p>3 that I have read the foregoing transcript of my</p> <p>4 testimony taken on 1/16/2020, and further certify</p> <p>5 that it is a true and accurate record of my</p> <p>6 testimony (with the exception of the corrections</p> <p>7 listed below):</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">Page</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Line</th> <th style="width: 80%;">Correction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>9</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>14</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>19</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>21 _____</p> <p>22 ANNA LEMBKE, M.D.</p> <p>23 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME</p> <p>24 THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 20__.</p> <p>25 _____</p> <p>(NOTARY PUBLIC) MY COMMISSION EXPIRES:</p>	Page	Line	Correction	9			10			11			12			13			14			15			16			17			18			19			20			
Page	Line	Correction																																						
9																																								
10																																								
11																																								
12																																								
13																																								
14																																								
15																																								
16																																								
17																																								
18																																								
19																																								
20																																								

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[& - 2011]

Page 1

&	100 28:20 96:14 131:13,14,18,18 131:25 248:20 249:5 261:4,11,19 264:4,10 10006 9:16 10019-9710 7:9 101 6:16 131:2 248:2 10:19 90:21 10:37 90:24 11 11:23 237:21 250:22 261:8 264:6 111 9:15 11501 3:18 11747 4:7 119 11:12 11:00 241:14 11:27 127:6 12 11:24 28:1,6,16 70:23 71:1 86:25 90:11 120:19 154:14 155:16 156:15,25 250:24 263:13 264:18 265:12,15,24 285:9 12/19/19 11:8 13:8 122 235:17 126 11:14 127 10:9 12:16 127:9 13 11:5,7 12:1 31:10 60:8 257:2 273:20 285:24 288:10 289:15 314:2 14 12:2 286:1 298:9,19 314:9	14th 16:17 15 28:6 45:10 47:23 77:4 90:16 131:9 155:17 157:8 235:19 237:21 248:10 150 264:4 154 11:16 16 1:16 2:17 10:4 10:8 13:1,10 187:12 167 10:10 17 130:23 247:22 18 10:20,22 154:16 156:16 247:22 260:19 1800 6:16 1850 12:1 285:24 18th 4:15 19 18:13 28:16 71:1 118:5 131:10 248:10 300:11 1954 60:9,14 1960s 123:7,14 1980 31:22 32:7 1980s 31:12 32:9 1990s 31:13 32:10 43:22 63:13,14 65:13 104:2 209:1 209:1 1995 17:19 196:22 199:5,17 1996 60:14 1997 131:3 248:3 1998 101:25 103:9 1:15 167:12 1:23 167:16	126:14 157:6 236:7 286:11 298:12,21 2.5 28:8 20 17:13 24:14 26:6 36:24 45:10 67:22 81:13,23 82:5 122:25 135:21 199:24 233:23 244:17 268:18 304:15 315:23 20,000 20:1,7 56:10 200 3:17 9:6 264:4 200,000 20:15 2000 17:21 63:11 20005 5:8 2000s 75:10 79:14 80:1 123:10 2001 60:17 61:11 61:20,24 62:11,21 63:6 64:1,3 65:1,1 65:22 66:2,13 108:20 128:3 241:7 2002 65:1,17 118:3 121:7 2003 65:20 2006 28:11,17 131:4,9,14 248:3 248:18 2007 102:4 104:16 2008 260:8,10 2009 257:16 2010 84:13 257:14 257:16 263:18,21 267:7 2011 80:5 118:3 121:8 131:15,18 247:15 248:6,18
& 2:14 3:4 4:12,13 5:4 7:6,15 8:4,13 9:4,13 13:20 14:7 14:9,10,11,16,20 14:22,24 15:1,5,22 16:1 251:6 286:9 310:7			
0			
0.1 155:18 0.36 155:23 156:5 0.37 154:15 156:4 156:16 0.44 155:23 156:5 0.8 155:18 00362490 11:20,23 250:18,22 003892 12:2 286:1 00864412 257:4 01361692 12:1 285:24			
1			
1 11:5 13:5 16:23 29:10,23 78:5,7,17 94:14 109:12 110:17 111:10,12 126:1,4 257:22 267:24 302:6 307:22 308:4,6 1/14/20 11:6 13:6 1/16/14 11:19 238:18 1/16/2020 315:4 10 11:21 109:12 110:17 111:10,13 114:7 115:2 116:6 122:7 124:7 152:7 250:20 260:2 10,000 26:1			
	2		
	2 11:7 13:7 18:7 18:11,15 31:11 121:16 126:5,5,6		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[2011 - 614.281.3906]

Page 2

249:10 263:17,21 2012 28:11,17 58:10,15,24 59:23 60:4,4 64:14 104:3 249:10 305:9 309:8 2013 11:13 28:19 59:21 104:3 119:16 120:1 149:18 2014 28:19 123:6 2015 58:3,17 161:5 2016 40:10,13 64:22 84:14 114:21 117:7 122:20 131:5 248:4,9 2017 117:8 118:20 131:10 248:9,10 248:21 2019 18:13 19:19 117:11 202.434.5421 5:9 2020 1:16 2:17 10:4 13:1,11 35:4 161:5 316:21 20th 9:15 316:21 21 10:20,21 212.397.1000 4:8 212.616.7057 9:17 212.836.7408 7:10 213.430.6326 4:17 21st 31:13 22 298:21,24 300:11 23 62:13 236 11:18 238 11:19 24 236:7 244:4 240 3:17	25 10:21 84:13 187:12 248:11 250 7:8 11:20,21 11:23,24 264:4 251 10:11 26 101:22 272 10:12 275 2:14 3:8 285 12:1 286 10:13 12:2 2900 2:15 3:8 2:00 241:13,13 2:31 215:22 2:48 215:25 3 3 11:9 67:3,5 68:21 241:21 256:23,24,25 265:24 266:3 3.5 244:9 30 78:1 114:7 122:7,25 124:8 152:7,12 190:8 202:14 222:13 244:18 300 8:6 3000 8:15 301 10:14 305 4:6 305.415.3387 9:8 310 10:15 312.494.4405 6:8 312.8622740 8:8 325 5:17 33131-2339 9:7 3462 1:24 2:18 316:4,25 36.0 248:20 360 150:8,13 151:3 3:02 226:24	3:03 227:2 3:18 236:18 3:20 236:23 3:24 239:12 3:25 239:15 3:42 250:16 3:48 251:2 4 4 11:12 28:8 119:24,25 120:6 120:14 149:21 157:6 237:6,7 40 117:6 122:20 235:18 40,000 199:6 201:5 400 4:6,15 400000/2017 1:6 2:6 13:18 410 120:15 415.315.6358 7:19 415.659.5987 6:18 415.956.1000 3:10 43215-2673 5:18 44 84:13 442 131:3 248:3 46.0 248:17 47 131:13 49 120:19 286:14 286:16 492 131:4 248:4 4:00 241:13,13 4:17 272:19 4:25 272:21 4:42 285:22 4:45 286:4 5 5 8:16 11:14,16 22:14,19 126:20 126:22 149:3,16 149:25 151:12	154:3,5,25 155:2 156:3,11 180:20 194:17 195:12,15 273:20,23 298:20 298:21 50 10:21 101:7 145:25 190:10 240:22 261:3,11 261:19 264:4,9 294:20 50,000 300:4 500 19:23 51 131:14 51.1 248:18 5150 244:23 516.248.3302 3:19 52 10:21 237:22 5300 9:6 54 6:6 5411 316:24 543 11:17 154:6,13 55 10:22 55th 7:8 58 114:4 5:07 300:22 5:09 300:25 5:20 310:1 5:21 310:4 5:27 2:16 314:21 314:23 6 6 11:16 22:14,19 22:23 68:21 120:11,17 154:3,5 187:13 600 5:17 6042 120:11 60654 6:7 8:7 61 131:17 614.281.3906 5:19
--	--	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[64 - actions]

Page 3

64 155:18 650.632.4734 8:18 667 288:8 67 11:9	96 118:3 123:5 9:03 55:14 9:26 55:17	abuse 84:25 181:15,19 182:10 182:18 183:20 184:19 193:12,20 193:25 194:12 224:13,14,15,22 225:7 226:7 227:23 281:5,18 306:20	114:10 184:10 315:5 316:13 accurately 47:15 72:17 79:8,21 184:13 205:5 225:1
7	a		
7 11:18 236:19 237:1 70 117:22 119:17 131:18 152:13,14 71.8 121:8,10 725 5:7 73 234:20 235:15 75 123:10 261:3,11 261:19 263:24 264:5 76 28:12 70:24	a.m. 2:16 13:2,10 55:14,17 90:21,24 127:6 abatement 91:23 abbreviation 237:12 abby 3:6 15:3 ability 89:10 148:14 175:11 213:11 233:9,10 316:15 able 46:15 49:16 85:2 86:14 90:4 114:3 137:21 146:18,23 147:20 148:2,8 149:1 158:8,13 164:10 165:6,11 166:1 184:1 187:15 193:1 203:24 221:19 229:12 232:21 253:9 258:2 262:22 290:1	abused 281:17 abusers 59:25 abusing 282:14,18 abv.com 9:18 academic 69:9 accept 51:6 accepted 41:1 105:9,25 access 26:7 31:15 52:19,20 57:4 75:22 77:21 124:24 137:14,18 218:25 219:1,24 245:12 246:17 251:22 252:5 accidental 26:9 140:6 account 40:7 149:12 152:19 183:19,25 189:20 194:19 204:23 accredit 107:20 accreditation 107:14,23 110:6 accredited 108:3 accumulation 159:2 accuracy 211:13 240:8 accurate 27:24 34:20 49:15 62:14 96:14 105:11	achieve 146:18 147:14 acknowledge 148:11 232:20 acknowledged 189:23 acknowledgment 315:1 acquired 273:11 acquisitions 273:12 acronym 132:4,5 act 32:14 96:24 147:15 171:18 220:3 actavis 9:3 15:2 298:18 299:2,4,8 301:4,5,7,9,11,16 301:18 302:7,8 acted 96:5 212:20 220:2 acting 164:6 200:7 200:9 263:16 264:7 265:25 268:23,25 269:1,6 269:7,17,18 304:6 action 215:2,3,5 217:21 259:6,8 281:24 316:17,18 actions 35:18 74:3 84:18 164:9 176:14 177:16,19 177:22 178:12 179:6,12 191:14 245:13
8			
8 11:19 238:18 239:18 80 123:8 242:11 298:5 800 19:25 144:21 85 29:7,20 124:20 86 118:19 89 84:11 8:06 2:16 13:2,10			
9			
9 11:20 22:23 23:5 23:17 29:9,21 250:18 256:19 257:7 263:20 9/11 240:11,20 90071-2899 4:16 90s 63:12 213:3,4 276:10 94105 6:17 94111-3339 3:9 94111-4006 7:18 94306-2112 8:17	abroad 253:14 abruptly 165:20 abscess 242:17 absence 139:7 193:13,20 217:19 298:7 absent 147:10 148:9 151:3 165:4 absolute 123:20 abstain 147:15,20 147:21 148:24 abstinence 147:14		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[actiq - ages]

Page 4

actiq 287:13 303:19 304:5,10 304:17 309:9,10 309:20 active 147:8 198:4 229:2 265:22 actively 44:17 58:17 93:12 180:8 activities 210:17 211:21 activity 99:25 217:16 293:12 295:22 actor 133:12 actors 35:16 actual 87:18,19 119:23 174:13 190:13 197:20 206:20,21,21 207:1,2 216:3 217:15 218:18 249:3 269:3 acute 32:8 47:2 83:4 187:6,7 259:11,14 260:19 260:23 261:1 262:4 263:3,6,8 266:25 add 36:25 45:25 56:24 186:13 191:11 261:22 275:14 302:18 added 21:4 56:13 56:17 112:8 146:2 288:8 289:16 291:14 addict 240:23 addicted 35:24 44:18 65:9 72:3 75:12,19 76:13 77:24 83:9 93:25	109:17 122:13,18 122:25 191:16 192:13 209:12 211:4 249:16 252:11 253:23 254:10 281:13 282:25 296:14 addiction 17:6,7,8 23:2,9 26:9 29:3 38:12 39:7,8,10 43:25 44:3 47:17 48:18 52:12,13 59:20 77:19,21 78:4 84:15 92:1 92:22 94:13 98:23 114:5 119:13 122:9 124:7 129:5 137:6,15 139:8 140:19 146:4,8,9 146:12,15,24 147:14,18,22 148:12,13,21 158:23,25 171:7 171:12 174:21 181:20 182:10,18 183:3,22 184:7,20 186:1 190:7 193:13,21,25 194:5,12,17,20 195:11,12,15 197:2,7,17,19,23 209:17 213:8 214:11,22 215:4 218:15 224:15,23 225:7,13 226:8 227:4,8,23 228:1,8 228:17 229:20 231:21 233:6 234:24 235:9,12 237:3,23 242:9 244:21 245:9	246:2,4,15 253:9 253:10,21 283:1 285:11,14 306:14 310:11,14,23 311:8,16,20 312:3 312:6,12 313:8,18 addictions 146:6 addictive 37:1,8 38:9,13,13 149:2 193:2 198:8 203:8 282:1 284:22 addicts 237:9 adding 28:19 addition 276:20 additional 39:1 167:4 169:7 277:1 address 65:16 85:9 86:6 104:1 112:13 addressed 64:15 addresses 64:22 adequacy 274:2,5 274:17,21 adequate 223:2 adequately 132:15 adjustments 211:16 administer 44:15 administered 316:8 administration 202:23 admit 21:4 95:9 210:14 211:18 214:4,5 283:13,14 admitted 242:16 admonition 169:6 adolescents 59:13 118:24 adopted 110:23	adult 59:13 adulterated 122:16 152:3 adults 84:15 154:15 264:24 266:18 advantage 177:12 adverse 152:24 220:1 281:18,23 282:4,21 283:2,3,9 284:21 advice 22:17 51:7 53:5,7 advise 190:24 191:20 312:1,5,5 advised 146:23 advocacy 78:18 advocate 262:13 advocated 110:16 affect 84:7 271:14 affiliates 272:1,5 affirmative 201:25 afford 262:14,22 afield 56:25 afilalo 265:10,21 267:6 afraid 103:24 231:5 afternoon 127:14 127:15 167:18,19 251:4 286:6,7 301:2 310:6 afterward 77:2 age 84:13 120:19 154:15 156:16 agencies 36:4 agent 170:12,19 270:5,17,21 agent's 270:9 ages 155:17 187:12
--	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[aggregate - answer]

Page 5

aggregate 151:6 151:13,18 208:3 220:6 222:1 aggressive 146:17 ago 48:11 80:16 104:8 199:24 agonist 114:22 180:20 agony 32:8 agree 22:12 30:2,8 30:25 31:4,8 53:14 87:18,18,20 88:7,18 113:10,21 116:9 141:25 146:5 153:8,13,18 153:22,23 162:12 162:17 181:9,11 181:18 182:16 185:15 187:2 193:19,24 195:20 201:16,18,23 202:5,20 203:12 204:9 205:2,10,14 210:23 211:1,2,5 217:16 218:5,18 219:21,22 222:4,6 223:5 224:7,11,17 224:18 225:13 226:1,17 227:3 228:13 229:1,6 230:14 234:2,7 236:13 247:15 252:17 255:19,22 263:4 265:1,6 279:20 280:9 289:22 296:24 307:9 310:10,22 311:6,14 312:16 312:20 313:5,11 agreed 13:25 168:17 230:5	agreeing 202:3 agreement 20:22 21:21 22:1 55:22 271:7 agreements 20:19 22:6 ahead 74:23 75:9 akin 94:22 al 29:8 187:10 237:12,15 265:10 307:14 alcohol 84:25 86:11 224:14 235:18 241:15 alcoholism 86:12 alert 62:22 63:1,7 63:17 64:1,17 65:2 95:4,25 96:4 218:15 283:4,6 algorithms 204:17 alive 244:8 allegaert 9:13 15:22 alleged 173:9 174:6 allegedly 249:16 249:21 308:18 allergan 8:3 12:1 14:23 285:24 286:9,24 287:2,3,5 287:8,12,17,22,24 288:7,14,18,22 289:1,9,22 290:2,9 290:11,17,22 291:2,2,6,10,11,19 292:1,2,5 293:12 293:19 294:13,25 295:2,13 296:5,10 296:15,19 298:17 299:2,4,8,14,18 300:3,15 314:5	allergan's 294:1 294:10,12 295:6,8 295:14,22 allocate 178:15 allow 21:23 151:19 229:12 allowed 56:7 allows 35:4 258:1 262:9,11 alluded 94:23 alternative 85:4 85:14,23 95:23 214:8 alternatives 191:8 alto 8:16,17 61:16 amazon 57:14,23 america 125:2,13 125:17 156:25 251:20 america's 237:3 american 36:6 102:23 110:21 156:5,9 americans 114:16 115:10,16,18 124:10 129:4 152:16 153:9,14 153:19,24 156:16 157:6,8 165:24 245:9 amerisourceberg... 6:13 14:15 69:19 101:10 104:17 amount 21:5 79:24 145:16 159:9 230:20 268:13 amounts 26:2 102:3,18 103:3,12 analgesia 26:3 89:5 129:24	analgesic 195:21 260:18 263:3 264:22,24 266:19 268:3,11 analgesics 311:4 313:2,7,18,20 analog 111:10 analyses 235:14 278:14 293:2,7,16 analysis 27:2,7,12 27:14 28:10 114:23 125:11,15 130:20 144:7,11 144:15 151:10 173:2,6,7 174:4,11 176:1,20 178:8,9 178:10 235:10 279:6 292:15,18 292:23 293:11,22 293:23,25 294:7 294:15,17,22 analyze 116:8 157:20 analyzed 40:10 132:14 157:16 278:19 anesthesia 17:9 47:22 244:10 angela 7:7 14:16 272:23 angela.vicari 7:11 angeles 4:16 anna 1:14 2:12 10:7 11:2,7,10 13:7,13 16:25 67:6 237:7 238:1 238:9 314:20 315:2,21 answer 10:19 20:22 21:3,23 22:1,10,13,17 46:8
---	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[answer - arbitblit]

Page 6

46:16 47:15 51:5 52:24 53:2,4,6,8 55:22 57:21 60:10 65:11 72:14 78:19 79:9,14,16,21 81:20,21 85:20 102:7 103:8 115:10 122:5 123:21 124:17 134:14 136:16 138:4,9 141:7,10 143:17 144:6 147:16 156:18 161:12,15 166:6 169:7 173:13,23 174:3 179:15 187:15 198:6 206:15 211:12 219:12 221:11 232:2 271:1 279:1 279:2,4,5,11,13,15 279:15,18 281:5 289:7,13 295:16 296:6,7 301:16,18 303:7 309:17 answered 21:23 53:3 89:13 139:6 142:22 175:10 186:12,14 220:18 220:20,21 221:1 221:23 276:6 289:12 answering 78:24 126:12,12 188:4,5 235:2,4 242:21 273:13 answers 50:9 antabuse 85:1 anybody 15:6 63:1 63:17 78:1 216:25	anyway 208:12 apologize 239:20 267:24 apparent 249:3 appealing 36:4 37:9,24 appear 109:14 136:23 137:11 139:2 140:8 179:5 237:17 249:12 appearances 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 appeared 249:11 appearing 15:6 299:11 appears 18:19 91:15 239:4 263:21 appendix 286:12 287:25 289:10 291:18,25 298:12 298:21,22 299:9 299:10 302:6 307:22 308:4,6 applies 135:2 158:16 apply 151:22 152:1 293:8 295:18 303:10 appointment 17:9 47:21 209:14 apportioned 178:11 appreciate 72:1 101:23 161:12 213:10 appreciating 142:8 approached 19:18 146:22	approaching 150:14 appropriate 30:11 73:15 86:21 91:22 114:11 132:21 133:7,22 134:5 147:22 181:14,16 203:23 205:23 208:15 262:4 312:7 appropriately 205:11 224:20 225:5,24 226:5 appropriateness 205:6 approval 108:4,7 260:4,8 263:15 267:3,5 approved 35:2 263:17 305:14,20 307:11 approximate 56:20,22,24 57:8 254:23 255:1 approximately 28:11 56:10 63:11 80:16 122:7 154:15 187:12 199:6 235:17 285:15 approximation 57:2 april 58:3 257:14 257:16 263:18,21 arbitblit 3:5 15:4 15:4 19:12 20:17 21:2,9,20 22:11 24:11 27:5 29:17 31:7 32:17 33:25 34:10 35:11 37:12 37:20 39:12 41:11	42:10,18 45:13 46:12,21 47:8 48:9 49:6,11,25 51:2,14,24 52:23 53:11,17 54:4,10 55:12,21 56:12 57:16,22,25 59:7 67:20 70:22 71:11 71:18 72:25 73:16 74:7 75:7 79:4 80:4 81:6,16 82:3 82:17 85:16 86:18 88:11,20 89:1 90:18 92:12 94:7 95:5 96:1 97:8,25 98:16 99:17 100:1 113:24 114:13 115:21 116:15 117:2 119:20 123:19 124:2 126:21,25 127:4 133:24 135:9 143:2 145:9 146:7 147:1 148:4,6,19 150:11 151:16 153:12 154:20,24 161:25 162:16 163:10,14 164:7 165:10 168:13,19 170:3 172:15 173:11,15 174:8 175:9,18 176:11 177:8 178:5,17,23 179:3,20 180:7,18 182:13,21 183:14 184:11,23 186:9 186:18 187:23 188:3,8,16 189:11 191:1,21 192:20 194:3,15 195:2,23 199:18 200:25
---	---	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[arbitblit - authority]

Page 7

201:8,21 202:4,12 202:25 203:17 204:13 205:8 206:5,10,23 212:11 214:18 215:1,6,16,19 216:10 217:17 218:6,9,22 219:10 219:19 220:11,18 220:24 221:5,21 223:12 224:24 225:8 226:9 228:15 230:15 231:25 233:14,18 234:6 235:1,13 236:8 238:6,9 246:6 247:18 250:3 251:16 252:19 254:4 255:17,21 256:20 259:12,20 262:6 262:16,24 265:4 268:4 269:2 270:17,25 271:4 271:22 272:3 273:21 276:5 278:7,17 279:10 280:13 285:20 288:11,24 289:11 295:15 296:11 297:2,14,25 298:10 299:16 302:17 303:2,21 305:10 310:12,17 310:24 311:9,21 312:13 313:9,24 314:14,17 arcos 26:19 27:9 28:10,21 29:8,21 218:25	area 34:5 48:23 85:3 91:14 113:12 113:16 135:18 166:25 170:13 209:13 argue 79:24 191:5 argument 218:24 271:5 argumentative 52:23 arithmetic 153:8 arm 243:13,20 armchair 125:8 arnold 7:6 14:16 arnoldporter.com 7:11 arrive 145:5 article 29:8 40:10 40:13 60:13 64:14 80:24 114:21 117:7,12 119:22 119:23 123:2 180:20,21 181:4 236:8,10 294:18 articles 59:4 293:17 articulate 134:9 articulated 129:19 149:25 artificial 194:18 194:25 195:8,14 ascertain 217:14 aside 67:25 121:22 147:12 157:14 204:7 238:16 261:6 asked 57:20 75:13 85:20 122:3 145:19 173:25 198:12 220:18 221:10 232:1	239:2 270:23,25 273:22 277:1 281:4 289:11 asking 80:18 111:12 112:11 132:4 135:8 158:12 162:10 175:14 179:15 268:15,17 276:3 285:20 301:10 303:12 308:24 309:4 314:15 aspect 139:18 assert 260:25 assess 18:17 39:14 189:24 228:13,16 284:10,19 285:11 assessed 109:11,13 111:6 114:24 assessment 47:11 48:16 150:10 153:2 181:12 190:3 assessments 203:16 224:4 assign 137:21 associate 17:5 associated 64:19 118:25 197:24 223:3 263:11 305:4 association 118:9 118:15,16 156:10 associations 120:7 169:24 234:3 assume 18:18 28:14 41:24 42:2 101:6,9 106:20 172:11 217:20 221:10,12,18 231:14 233:9	262:12 292:1 assumes 34:17 51:24 assuming 18:22 73:14 114:10 172:20 223:7 assumption 223:16 assumptions 221:9 assured 16:20 attached 257:24 attempt 148:16,20 attempting 150:7 attempts 212:24 attend 56:8 60:20 61:11,13 66:12 attended 17:18 61:17 62:21 128:3 132:16 attendees 62:22 attending 61:5 attention 257:12 267:18 303:11 attorney 3:15 15:9 15:14 106:21 attorneys 247:4 attributable 180:5 180:8 290:2,9 attribute 213:12 audio 13:24 augths 17:22 45:3 60:2 65:13 75:21 104:2 276:10 augmented 172:5 august 11:13 119:25 aureus 243:13 authorities 95:4 95:25 96:4 97:15 authority 216:9 271:1
--	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[authorization - believe]

Page 8

authorization 50:12	72:9 74:25 75:6,8 79:1,5,10,17,18,18	bandage 244:11	battery 2:14 3:8
authors 236:5	79:19 80:3,12,15	banning 185:11	bcibulka 3:13
autonomous 205:1	80:15,23 92:20	bar 195:13	bear 133:16 135:3 135:12 138:2,6 177:1,6 180:4
autopsy 158:18	244:22 282:2,3,7	bartlit 6:4	bears 257:7
availability 124:24 302:16	awolf 3:12	bartlitbeck.com 6:9	beast 95:16
available 78:1	b	base 28:23 34:2 87:21 157:1 173:19,19 175:2 189:4 267:5 284:7	beck 6:4
85:8,15,24 86:4,4 105:3,4 113:11,23 114:5 122:12 150:17,21 248:21 258:13 261:3 263:24 264:4,9	b 66:15 67:18 68:3 275:12,20 276:3 276:17,24 278:5 286:12 287:25 289:10	based 24:17 25:23 25:24 26:5,21 28:21 29:8 33:18 37:15,16 42:4 45:17,17 70:24 81:9 82:7,8 105:16 113:2 118:1 122:3 123:3 124:4,16 129:20 131:25 140:12 142:9 151:6 159:3 159:23 170:15 171:6 184:2 189:9 196:25 203:14 206:19 207:23 208:2,3,16 212:6 221:9 228:14 234:12 247:6 248:13,15 249:4 249:14,24 250:6 259:23 271:25 296:23 314:8,11	becoming 35:23 75:19 76:13 192:25 240:22
average 155:21 156:6 236:1	bachelor's 17:17	basic 153:7	bed 189:17
avoid 182:1	back 19:13 55:16 59:18 63:25 74:16 76:22 90:23 112:14 127:8 167:15 173:24 194:10 199:16 201:17 215:24 222:4 227:1 236:22 239:14 241:3,5,9 251:1 255:5 267:24 272:21 286:3 288:12 299:12 300:24 303:6 310:3	basically 245:2	began 31:11,12 32:22 43:21 63:23 64:6,20 65:8,16 75:10,20 79:13 119:13 209:13,15 242:12 249:10 252:9 282:7,10
aware 16:20 20:19 25:19 26:25 27:8 38:1 67:1 78:13 83:2 93:2 102:15 103:23 104:20 106:25 113:6 127:24 128:2 129:20 130:8 138:11 139:16 159:7,12,13 171:23,25 172:7 193:4 206:25 213:1,22 221:24 222:1 247:8 258:10 271:8,12 283:12 285:3 299:7 302:11,14 302:18,23 303:14 303:19 304:5,8 305:8,13,19 306:19 307:3,8 309:7,8,11,18	background 17:15	based 259:14	beginning 2:15 65:7,13 239:19 259:4
awareness 25:23 26:14,18,21 65:7	bad 105:20,21	basis 22:7,10 36:8 47:3,6 48:19 89:8 92:22 167:6 200:5 209:3 271:6 287:6	begins 13:12 119:4
	badala 4:5 15:18 15:18,18	bates 257:7 288:7	begun 247:17
	badgering 174:9 220:19		behalf 2:13 13:14 14:11,14,23,25 15:3,9,14,19,22 16:1 148:2 166:14 311:7
	balance 215:5		behavior 50:18 52:13 133:13 159:4 193:2 214:3
	balances 213:11 213:15 214:24		behaviors 159:3
	ball 232:20		belief 36:16 73:14 208:16
	ban 185:4,7 252:22 253:2		believe 36:10 38:9 43:8 52:10 68:8,9 73:19 74:1 94:15 94:16 99:7,12,12 101:13 102:11 110:7 113:18

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[believe - broadly]

Page 9

119:22 130:4,12 131:24 133:25 136:25 138:1 142:11 144:19 146:1 149:20,23 157:5 162:7 165:8 168:5 173:16 176:7,14,24 177:17 179:22,22 180:3 186:6 194:4 196:4 197:3 207:25 208:15 212:21 219:16 220:16 223:21,25 226:19 230:10 238:20 253:6 265:11 266:21 267:5 269:15 272:4 277:21 278:22 284:24 290:4,22 291:11 292:14 293:15 294:22 298:13 301:12,20 305:23 307:7 314:2 believed 63:7 64:2 65:2 75:16 83:13 believing 32:21 73:9 164:1 bell 132:6 belong 169:24 beneficial 191:9 benefit 47:11 48:16 53:19 153:2 186:8,21,24 187:3 188:18,20 191:5 203:22 224:4 263:9 benefits 30:18 53:24 62:17 135:24 136:4	165:1 191:8 203:15 204:4,10 206:13 306:6 benefitted 35:17 benign 187:17 255:12,16,20,23 benzodiazepines 82:22 140:4 berger 9:13 15:22 bernstein 2:14 3:4 13:20 15:5 16:1 best 68:5 79:21 94:3,5,21 95:2 108:11,14 114:5 141:13,19 147:8 152:12 175:11 198:6 200:14 201:10 204:22 213:11 316:14 better 46:15 122:5 185:24 186:22 218:19 219:2 220:3 230:25 240:15 262:21 beyond 37:4,7 38:5,7,12 75:21 78:20 91:16 166:16 215:10 223:19 bias 284:25 285:2 285:3,6 big 40:12 44:21 113:5 205:13 228:5,5 biggest 77:20 bill 64:9 144:23,25 145:2,3,4 billion 28:6,8,12 28:16,20 37:14,19 38:2,2 70:24 71:1 193:7	billions 25:24 bind 203:5 binder 11:14 126:16,22 biological 159:1 bipolar 228:10 biscayne 9:6 bit 56:18 114:19 207:21 211:14 235:7 311:23 black 266:9,11 blame 138:2,6 259:1 blanket 205:13 blind 36:1 blinded 284:14,14 blood 110:14 111:6 159:2 board 66:14 81:13 81:24 99:2,4,5,10 99:20,22 100:5,8 100:13 101:4 103:21,25 104:5 106:18 boards 69:2 70:11 100:23,25 101:1,3 101:5,7,12,15,24 102:1 103:1,10,18 104:23,25 105:6,7 105:23 106:10,19 106:22 107:2,6,10 202:18 275:25 bob 219:6,16 body 42:3,4 44:16 99:13 140:21 291:18 book 58:17 64:20 64:23 101:25,25 102:4 104:9,12,15 104:19,21 105:1,8 105:12,19,21,24	106:13 107:5 111:23 140:22 178:9 238:23 239:5,18 240:23 293:17 booths 62:6 bottom 82:6 120:11 229:15 257:14 boulevard 5:17 9:6 box 266:6,8,9,11 brain 159:1 194:21 195:18 223:18 brain's 190:15 branded 172:3,5 172:24,25 200:11 301:14 302:19,21 break 55:11 90:16 90:25 91:17 92:14 126:24 147:13 215:19 breakthrough 304:7 breathing 110:13 brick 107:8 briefly 17:14 bring 57:6 bringing 28:19 britt 3:7 15:25 broad 40:22 201:22 broader 161:18 183:20 202:7 219:20 258:23 broadhollow 4:6 broadly 117:20 129:3 139:10,16 163:22 183:2 188:11 253:10,12
--	--	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[broadly - causation]

Page 10

290:11 broadway 9:15 brought 130:3,5 buffalo 76:24 94:25 buprenex 241:7 241:11 buprenorphine 181:2 201:2 209:17,25 241:5 282:10 burling 8:13 14:25 310:8 burrough's 240:23 business 176:21 213:21,25 217:23 218:2 businesses 211:3 218:2,20 221:19 busse 188:21 buying 63:2 buynak 267:6	66:14 86:12 196:19,23 206:16 241:3 293:13 316:1 call 83:11 98:10 180:6 214:24 231:21 called 37:19 46:6 61:9 77:16 82:20 83:14 98:6,11 99:4,6 102:4 112:16 137:16 calls 50:10 74:19 98:2 calm 188:4 calves 244:12 camino 8:15 campaign 84:7 102:24 280:1 289:1 campaigning 102:21 campaigns 83:25 84:22 cancer 77:3 146:9 185:8,13 187:22 188:15 283:20 284:4 304:7 candidate 229:4 capacity 147:18 147:23 capture 118:11 card 257:24 cardinalhealth 5:3 14:8 69:15 88:23 89:2 101:10 104:17 care 44:22 51:19 52:15 61:5 73:15 90:4,7,7 95:17 107:21 108:8	111:8 159:9 161:7 165:23 178:20 183:23 191:12 192:11 210:17 214:10 217:3 232:18 233:8,9 256:11 269:21 283:5 284:9 285:13 career 43:22 62:25 80:17 135:21 196:22 199:7,13 199:15 206:14 208:19 212:5 275:16,21 287:6,9 301:24 304:14 careful 45:16 57:4 82:8 153:2 carefully 293:18 carter 5:16 10:9 14:12,12 30:23,23 127:14,16 133:18 134:3 135:15 143:5 145:13 146:20 147:10 148:5,8,20 149:3 150:14 151:22 153:18 154:2,7,23 155:2 156:23 162:10,23 163:12 164:4,11 166:1 167:2,10 314:12 314:15 case 13:16 19:10 20:24 31:19,21 33:21 35:22 42:9 53:21 54:13 67:17 68:7 70:17 80:8 87:13 89:9,16 91:3 98:9 126:9 127:22 128:5,9,15	129:2,17 130:3,5,8 130:11 133:2 134:4 136:8,13,24 138:20 139:12 145:1 158:1,2 159:7,19 160:10 160:14,18,22 161:18 163:6 164:12,20 166:11 168:10 172:2 175:23 176:9,13 189:8,10 194:7 195:5 196:15,25 197:1,4 202:19 206:17,19 207:23 221:25 223:17 231:10 235:10 245:14 246:2,20 247:6 249:14,24 250:6 262:18 272:25 277:4,7 282:5 283:1,18 286:10,21 287:11 287:23 288:3,7,19 291:9 299:6 cases 22:6 75:4 103:23 145:14 146:9 148:21 159:12,13 182:2 197:20 198:3 206:12 211:16,24 212:4,12 213:19 216:18 232:14 306:24 catch 90:3 92:15 95:3,7 categorize 149:8 causal 234:5 293:22 causation 168:2,7
c			
c 3:5 4:5 7:16 144:19 cabinet 72:8 74:6 117:18 cabinets 74:20 75:24 81:5,11 cabraser 2:14 3:4 13:19 15:4,25 calculated 115:2 146:2 calculation 56:5 157:11 263:9 calculations 114:15 california 1:15 2:15 3:9 4:16 6:17 7:18 8:17 13:1,20 60:20 61:12,16			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[causative - classify]

Page 11

causative 227:21 caused 37:24 147:7 178:2,21 211:3 causes 125:16 caution 39:2 232:10 caveat 31:3,8 cbhsq 11:12 119:25 cdc 80:5 83:2 131:11,24 138:11 138:16,21 248:16 249:4 cell 14:2 center 7:17 69:11 183:4 century 31:13 76:5 cephalon 301:4 308:5,8,19,22 certain 61:6 96:13 107:7 108:1,9 231:3 234:13 263:2 307:24 certainly 44:16 102:20 105:4,20 147:6 183:16 199:2 200:3 245:19 283:4 304:15 313:13 certainty 95:8,19 95:21 96:3 certification 209:16 certified 2:18 16:3 certify 306:20 307:3 315:2,4 316:5,16 cetera 105:18 111:7 204:20	chain 23:25 24:3,5 24:9,18 25:3 26:19 30:6 33:11 34:6,7,12 35:8,14 35:16 36:5,9 50:15 56:19 57:11 57:15,24 83:23 91:12 127:25 128:21 133:13,14 134:2 135:3 137:5 137:8 139:17 165:3 chains 135:18 challenging 203:11 chance 43:1,4 247:5 chances 223:22 change 23:18 31:25 32:3,5 33:4 33:8 40:1,2 44:7 52:18 90:8 97:1 139:23 217:2 230:5,6 290:21 changed 32:10 106:14 139:14 changes 43:4 194:21 244:11 changing 97:20 chapter 59:11 characterized 193:14,21 194:22 298:4 charge 145:7 chart 158:9 chat 167:22 cheap 240:21 241:22 cheaper 122:12 check 30:15,15 92:23 93:13	134:16,24 215:5 checking 82:18 299:20 checks 213:10,15 214:23 cheek 35:25 chemical 147:22 chen 219:6,16 221:7,12 231:15 231:21 233:5 chicago 6:7 8:7 chief 17:7 69:11 childhood 227:24 china 241:23,25 chinese 167:23 choice 147:19,24 148:15 149:1 230:20 choose 204:25 chronic 32:11,23 43:13,18,25 44:1 45:2,9,21 46:5 47:1,20,24 60:10 77:6 80:18 105:10 105:16 106:1,16 114:6 146:13 152:9 153:9,20,24 164:3 181:24,25 185:13,16,18,19 185:21,23 186:7 186:17 187:21 188:15 189:10,25 190:6,21 191:4,4 209:13 222:7,22 223:1 235:16,21 240:21 259:11,14 259:19,22 264:23 265:3,16 266:18 267:1,20 268:16 283:20 284:4 306:11	chronologically 46:4 cibulka 3:7 15:25 15:25 cicero 123:5 242:11 circle 176:25 circumstance 49:8 53:13 54:6 65:24 192:10 circumstances 46:20 49:10,21 50:3 54:14 98:2 141:20 150:9 163:5 205:12 cite 74:14 120:14 187:9 233:23 234:14 258:14 cited 60:14 140:15 276:7 291:17 293:4 298:17 299:2,9,10 cites 154:25 190:5 citizens 26:1 38:23 city 241:5 claim 70:14 127:20 129:7 248:5 claimed 58:4 claiming 194:8 claims 116:7 clarification 47:14 241:21 clarify 19:12,15 19:16 20:18 120:14 182:5 188:7,8 189:4 clarifying 210:7 classic 110:15 classify 195:14
---	--	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[clean - compared]

Page 12

clean 243:10 clear 29:12 118:9 119:2 147:17 161:8 176:19 177:11,15 180:2 192:15 196:21 206:18 222:20 223:24 245:23 264:15 267:25 clearly 80:7 83:8 307:1 client 192:17,24 202:15 247:3 302:1 client's 161:17 clients 303:13 312:1 climate 94:11 clinic 17:8 46:23 46:24 69:11 77:2 77:2 92:20 94:22 97:20 111:5 112:12 199:2 213:9 284:5,7 clinical 26:5 42:5 45:18 46:15 48:18 67:23,25 68:1 77:15 96:2,22 113:3 119:11 150:15 151:5,7,20 151:22 152:1 171:7 183:8 187:4 205:4 206:11 210:11 211:17 229:11 232:5,18 233:8,9 256:5 263:5 268:7,20 269:12,14 276:7 284:9 285:13 304:9	clinically 188:20 188:24 265:11 284:19 clinician 150:6,22 171:11 219:1 276:8 clinics 94:23 107:22 108:2,22 209:15 clock 264:24 266:19 267:20 268:3,11 close 95:6 303:11 closely 38:21 90:1 95:18 119:8 closet 88:25 cme 61:11,15,20 61:22,25 62:5,11 62:21 63:6 64:3 65:1,17,21,23 66:2 66:13 128:3 202:18 cmes 61:9 65:24 coauthored 114:21 cocaine 121:18 241:14,15 254:10 collaboration 24:5 44:19 68:10 110:21 258:17 289:19 collaborative 289:25 collateral 93:13 colleagues 61:22 64:7,17,24 65:6,15 92:11 107:1,8 193:9 205:24 collectively 251:7 252:2	collusion 35:23 36:9,22 columbus 5:18 column 121:7 257:14 264:2 combination 106:9 109:1 140:4 140:4 172:3 193:15,22 201:12 combing 82:22 come 33:23 52:25 66:12 74:21 92:23 124:11,13 165:22 185:21 192:8 196:19,20 254:10 254:13 259:15 269:12 282:12 comes 26:18 38:10 99:20 181:24 198:7 204:24 312:7 comfortable 202:3 coming 63:25 74:8 75:11,25 80:18,23 193:16 304:18 comment 42:13 78:19 188:5 306:2 commentary 154:9 commented 270:2 commenting 186:3 comments 128:17 commission 69:2 70:11 107:13,16 107:18,19,23,25 108:3,12,15,16,18 108:20 110:16,20 110:23 202:17 230:24 315:25 commission's 108:24 109:25	commitment 147:11 148:10 committed 153:25 common 48:23 62:4 83:7 109:21 124:8 138:24 139:5,7,18 210:9 268:17 commonly 90:9 194:18 297:16 communicated 83:22 112:14 174:15 295:24 communication 149:9 communications 280:16 communities 40:24 124:22 193:5 community 26:3 38:24 39:6,10,19 64:9 69:9 80:2 82:9 84:17 89:5 117:19 129:25 135:16 137:10,18 154:16 155:17 160:20 161:1 189:22 218:14 220:7 243:18 comorbidities 228:2 companies 7:5 14:19 180:15 company 69:13 176:2 comparable 284:13 compared 123:14 188:25 218:19 265:10 285:10
--	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[compares - contain]

Page 13

compares 161:5 255:8 295:3 comparing 203:10 232:13 265:21 comparison 155:14 162:11 compass 73:23 compassionate 111:24 165:17 compassionately 44:24 46:2 165:23 compensation 56:3 complain 189:18 complaint 273:16 complete 65:23 66:20 177:24 228:25 237:24 271:7 completed 17:20 completely 187:16 completeness 261:23 complex 245:5 complexity 72:1 112:8 189:19 compliance 275:5 275:8 complicated 72:15 72:15 112:3 197:21 complies 18:9 comply 129:18 130:14 component 307:9 components 198:10 comprehensive 18:25 19:4,5 175:5 284:18	compton 117:7 122:20 compulsive 228:10 concede 221:25 concept 110:8 171:15 177:24 195:25 196:6 213:6 concern 39:16,17 39:19 63:19 65:6 75:18 97:1 118:23 concerned 50:18 65:15 83:14 97:12 214:1 concerning 25:14 25:17 89:17 91:4 276:23 concerns 16:18 95:15 181:19 182:10 conclude 135:7 174:25 concludes 314:19 conclusion 27:12 236:4 276:13 concrete 207:23 221:17 condemned 107:1 107:7 condition 75:18 94:19 98:20 124:6 182:24 183:9 192:19 194:9 195:7 196:17 231:19 256:2 312:9 conditions 32:12 32:23 54:14 106:17 164:3 169:2 185:5,8,12 194:22 227:25	228:1 condoning 106:11 conduct 16:18 173:7 174:4,10,13 258:23 292:15,17 conducted 27:2 127:25 130:19 144:7,11,15 151:10 175:5 278:14 279:6 294:25 conference 76:25 conferred 94:19 confidential 1:9 2:8 129:21 confidentiality 51:4,20 98:17 confirm 95:24 96:8 97:5,6 175:21 239:3 240:7 confirmatory 216:18 confirmed 213:24 confirming 20:25 confusing 312:14 connection 128:14 238:23 239:18 267:9 connolly 5:4 14:8 14:9 consequences 118:25 152:24 220:1 284:21 307:10 consider 57:23 68:6 94:2 128:10 150:20 171:8 175:23 186:19 251:14 252:6 277:4,8	consideration 183:16 considerations 149:12 considered 11:10 66:16,25 67:5,9,13 67:16 68:2,4 94:11 133:12 151:24 159:16 202:7 222:7,22 275:11 277:15 312:20,24 considering 183:5 252:5 consistent 98:3 216:5 261:21 289:2 290:14 consisting 26:1 consists 289:25 constant 191:7 constellation 151:24 construct 195:8 264:12 consult 51:15,18 consultant 69:12 consultation 196:19 consulted 50:21 170:6,14,22 consulting 145:21 145:24 170:7,11 consumers 30:6 30:11 64:24 consumption 149:2 256:3 contact 50:2 254:10,13 contacted 50:5 contain 18:15,19 18:22,25 19:3
--	--	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[contain - counsel]

Page 14

97:18 305:25 316:13 contained 109:5 133:2 154:10 278:4 contains 105:13 197:10 contend 137:23 content 291:11,13 contents 27:22 context 150:17 171:16,21 182:6 183:8,20 191:6 202:7 205:4 209:19 233:2 312:8 continue 47:7 48:4 48:8 180:12 201:1 217:23 continued 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 244:19 continues 54:23 continuing 45:20 60:17,18,21,24 61:1,6,8 63:21 68:25 70:2 142:3 142:9,17 153:6 163:3 continuous 264:24 266:18 267:20 268:3,23 contract 93:8,9 contraindications 30:16 222:8,23 contribute 112:17 299:21 contributed 22:25 23:1,9 24:18 25:21 26:16 40:20 68:22 80:11 106:5	106:23 116:13,17 124:25 133:14 162:5 178:2,21 180:16 251:23 275:18 276:10 290:11,13 292:11 294:1,13 contributing 33:6 107:10 179:5,10 180:5 203:8 218:13 258:17 contribution 117:1 176:2,4,5,7 176:8,13,20 235:11 contributor 28:2 129:5 175:24 control 88:9,19,21 89:10 205:1 240:9 240:20 controlled 25:11 99:24 100:7 265:14 283:24 284:3 convenience 194:6 conversation 47:3 57:12 94:24 170:21 conversations 14:2 45:14,16 48:2,15 76:19 77:14 113:4 159:24 170:18 convey 69:2 conveys 115:14 convince 280:2 297:7 convinced 63:3,4 97:16,23 217:8 convincing 29:12 182:3	cooperative 9:12 15:23 copies 104:22 copy 78:8 126:13 155:2 239:4 256:20 298:10 core 232:25 corner 77:22 corollary 84:24 86:10 coroner's 159:5 corporate 135:17 152:3 corporation 69:20 correct 18:2,3 20:3,9,16 33:2,3 41:5,6 42:17 44:5 57:2,10 67:19 68:4,5 79:15 92:7 92:8 103:17 124:1 126:10,15 128:5,7 128:8 129:12,13 149:16,19,21 150:2,5,22 151:17 151:25 152:9 154:10 155:3 156:2,7 158:17 172:24 173:5,10 174:7 175:8 176:18,22 177:2,3 179:19 196:24 197:7,8,12 198:13 198:15,18,20,21 199:17,21 207:20 227:12 237:17 239:4 249:22 254:12 257:4,7,8 261:19 262:1,5,10 263:19 264:8 267:11 270:8 274:6,18,19,22,23	274:25 275:5,6,8,9 275:13,14 277:5,6 277:9,10,13,14,17 279:9 280:12 281:14,15 282:5 282:15 283:21,22 283:25 286:18,23 288:19,20,23 289:10 290:9 291:9 292:3,20,21 292:22 293:14,24 294:24 295:1,4,7 295:10,11,22 299:15,24 302:9 302:10 307:25 308:1,3,4,6,7 309:5 314:1 correction 315:8 corrections 156:11 315:6 correctly 23:3 31:17 62:19 69:5 78:22 103:14 125:3 154:17 155:11,19,24 246:21 correlate 140:19 correlated 227:18 227:19 correlates 131:5 corresponds 237:25 cost 262:10 counsel 13:14 14:6 16:12,19 53:2 66:24 67:10 186:9 188:3 233:14,19 270:15 273:22 288:11,15 316:10 316:16
---	---	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[counsel's - daily]

Page 15

counsel's 22:17 51:6 53:5,7 55:24 counseling 44:22 count 212:7 239:24 counted 285:8 counteract 212:21 212:21 214:16 counties 130:18,25 135:6 137:7 139:9 140:17,20 159:13 162:14 163:22 164:17 196:14 207:12 293:9 counting 240:1 countless 119:12 countries 155:17 country 3:17 24:1 25:25 34:23 38:19 54:19 55:20 76:15 76:15 91:14 94:9 115:7 123:14 157:7 162:6 191:13 205:24 278:24 294:23 county 1:2 2:2 4:3 13:17 15:19 29:11 29:19,24 54:25 55:3,5 84:1,4,8,14 84:23 85:21 86:14 130:3,5,8,11,14,21 131:12,16,20 133:22,23 134:7 134:25 136:4,5,8,8 136:11,13,15 137:24 138:3,6,16 138:20 139:5,19 139:21 140:2 141:3,8 143:12,14 143:19,21 144:2,8 144:12 157:17	158:3,6,16 159:8 159:18 160:3,6,9,9 160:13,13,17,17 160:21,21 161:1,1 161:5,9,15,23 162:7 163:8,17 164:21 165:9 166:5 207:19 248:16,17 279:1,3 279:18 280:21,21 280:25 281:1,10 281:10,14,14 293:14 296:9,10 296:19,19 302:24 303:5 309:8,15,19 309:19 316:2 couple 53:14,15 86:24 104:8 159:15 193:10 208:9 242:25 257:12 coupon 257:25 258:1,20 259:18 261:9 262:12 263:18 264:11,16 coupons 36:11,16 36:19,22 68:9 course 60:18,22,25 66:3 126:12 139:23 146:14 148:17 151:25 158:11 185:3,6,10 185:14 190:19,25 199:7,15 212:4 224:5 225:14 230:13 275:21 280:6 285:9 courses 61:1,6,8 63:21 68:25 70:3 169:12	coursework 25:3,7 25:10 court 1:1 2:1 11:5 13:5,16,22 16:3,17 78:13 168:1 169:7 173:23 221:9 court's 78:11 167:4 courtesy 17:9 47:21 209:14 cov.com 8:19 cover 180:23 181:1,5 230:23 coverage 179:1,18 covington 8:13 14:24 310:7 crack 121:18 create 18:4 37:3 66:7 204:2 created 36:11,16 36:19 68:9 94:10 165:18 252:10 253:24 289:19,23 creating 31:15 215:8 274:9 293:19 crime 52:21 153:25 criminal 211:20 283:15 criminally 221:14 crisis 22:23 23:6 23:12 58:8 64:22 161:4 177:20 194:19 202:8 criteria 149:11,14 149:15,17 151:12 152:23 154:8 195:11,12,15 245:24	critical 133:12 crunching 293:5 crystal 232:20 csr 1:24 316:4,25 cultural 290:21 culture 106:14 cum 17:17 curable 146:10 curb 223:10,15 253:9 curbing 252:18 253:11 curious 190:18 269:13 current 17:4 25:21 133:16 191:11 229:5 232:25 301:6 currently 44:1 313:10 customers 33:23 128:22 130:15 132:16 137:25 cut 213:16 cutting 74:16 cv 59:8 cvs 130:5,14 134:13,24 135:3 cycle 147:13
d			
d 10:1 114:25 115:2,5,6 116:6 124:20 180:22,23 181:1 da 170:2,3 dad 246:21 dad's 243:15 dahl 102:22,25 300:8 daily 209:3 236:1 241:2 244:16			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[damage - departure]

Page 16

damage 196:5	248:10	decisions 112:20	231:10 245:12
dangerous 80:20	dc 5:8	decrease 248:6	246:5,10 251:7
80:25 82:21 93:1	dea 26:19 28:4	249:10 253:24	258:23,25 272:24
darbitblit 3:11	70:24 98:11 99:21	decreased 54:20	275:15 280:2
data 26:19,19 27:9	99:23 100:6 102:9	248:19	290:23 295:3
27:15 28:11,21	102:11,13 113:6	decreasing 247:17	301:13 303:7
29:9,12,21 74:8,12	113:21 170:4,6,7	deeper 152:5	307:24 308:3,5
84:12 111:11	170:12,19,22	deeply 147:19	defense 21:22
115:14 118:2,8,14	171:3,10 270:5	defendant 4:12	defer 274:14
122:6,17 130:20	dea's 113:10 114:1	5:3,14 6:3,13 7:3	define 73:1 150:12
130:22 131:11,16	dealer 58:18 76:8	7:14 8:3,12 9:3,12	208:7,10
131:19,22,23,24	117:17 238:25	15:23 70:16	defined 313:10
132:1,8 137:6	239:5	128:11,14 136:7	definitely 300:9
140:17 150:21	dealing 232:19	137:2,23 143:12	definition 208:8
151:3,20 152:6,12	death 23:2,10 26:9	165:8 166:4 172:8	208:20
153:4 157:17,21	38:12 78:4 92:1	172:18 173:4,10	degree 39:1 150:8
159:4 161:14,19	129:6 139:8 140:6	174:7 175:8 176:8	150:13 151:3
188:24 205:3	140:20 147:4	176:21 192:18	163:3 178:14
207:15,19,19	157:17,21 158:19	211:3 214:16	232:16 233:21
219:24 223:14	159:6 183:22	215:15 218:2,20	degrees 125:10
248:16,21 249:4,6	186:1 218:14	220:16 221:19	169:9,15,18
285:13	245:9 249:20	286:19 292:19,25	deleted 175:22
database 82:19	deaths 29:3 131:6	302:1	delirium 243:19
92:24 132:10	137:6 158:9	defendants 2:13	delivered 28:12
210:2 218:25	174:21	13:14 22:5 74:3	70:25
294:5,6	debate 264:14	84:18 94:10 109:6	delivery 203:4
date 11:12 13:10	decade 54:17	127:22,25 128:7	demand 33:19,22
45:7 119:25	63:11,15 66:5	129:18 130:2,5,7,8	35:19 252:12
257:13 305:12	decades 40:15	130:10 133:14	253:24
dating 199:16	76:4 110:15	138:20 139:11,14	demanded 231:2
263:18	117:15 146:16	139:16 141:6,9	demonstrate
david 102:22	174:20 298:3	144:2 164:20	29:12
day 5:15 62:23	decedent 158:3	168:3,10 172:2,4	demonstrating
79:8 209:25	december 18:13	172:11,21 174:2	123:12
241:18 244:7,10	decide 81:25	176:13,17 177:12	dentist 187:11
244:11 303:12	decides 230:11,17	177:22 178:12	deny 95:16
311:11 315:23	230:18	179:7,8,12 180:9	department 17:9
316:21	decision 83:10	191:14 194:6	47:21 166:19
days 48:11 50:16	85:13 112:24	195:5 202:15,19	209:14
53:15 131:9,10	143:8 262:3 267:3	209:5 210:24	departure 32:24
167:22 210:2	280:12	219:24 221:24	32:25

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[depend - direction]

Page 17

depend 33:22 49:7 49:10 54:23 71:20 98:1 108:11 dependence 48:17 194:1,6,8,13,17,21 195:6,16 242:6 245:20,21,23 dependency 147:22 313:6,16 dependent 37:3 44:18 65:9 108:13 165:19 189:2 192:25 195:10 204:6 209:12 depending 203:3 depends 45:23 53:12 54:5,21,22 183:7 189:14 213:18 297:15 deployed 172:12 deponent 315:1 deposition 1:14 2:12 11:1 13:12 13:13,19 16:23 18:7 42:21 43:2,8 78:14 120:6 125:25 126:13,20 135:11 140:16 167:14 211:15 238:21 251:5 273:18 277:4,8 304:18 314:20 316:6 depositions 16:19 depressed 231:16 233:5 depression 224:16 228:9 231:22 deprive 147:3 depth 143:1,4	describe 85:11 99:15 242:15 described 62:16 133:6,21 160:2 164:5 215:18 246:14 describing 205:4 205:25 description 11:4 296:18 304:10 design 171:3,9 284:2 designed 107:20 170:24 202:15 designing 171:14 202:9 desire 147:20 despite 298:7 detail 107:12 166:12 292:9 296:24 297:6 detailed 105:15 205:3 detailing 297:10 details 83:22 134:8 262:18 293:18 294:25 295:3 detect 95:11 203:24 214:16 215:4 218:20 219:2 221:19 determination 164:10 determine 38:22 51:16 82:15 132:15 144:7,11 144:16 165:1 205:5 232:21 234:11 278:14 279:6 284:3	293:11 determined 39:15 49:22 108:12,14 108:15 168:5 207:13 determining 143:8 devastation 125:1 125:12,16 develop 124:7 196:2 222:14 228:22 229:10,13 229:16 230:7 232:21 233:2,6 developed 48:17 152:16,21 153:10 153:15 245:22 developing 77:20 152:20 190:7 222:11 223:11,23 225:17 227:20 228:20 229:19,22 229:25 232:8 234:12 285:14 development 117:12 236:2 246:2 developmental 59:12 deviate 93:22 diabetes 255:25 diagnose 158:9 195:12 197:23 diagnosed 151:5 158:3 187:13 diagnoses 149:11 154:9 197:19,24 diagnosis 17:8 150:7,15 151:2,14 151:19 154:8 158:25 197:16 198:1,2,17 216:13	diagnostic 149:4 149:14 dictated 180:15 dictionary 149:9 die 146:19 died 159:10 280:19 296:3,9 differ 162:8 difference 42:12 188:25 265:12 differences 41:20 41:22 42:19 different 40:15 62:8 85:2,4,13,23 88:15 99:18 102:25 103:1 122:1 143:3 187:1 199:16 201:17 203:1 205:19 207:21 232:15 235:7 249:7 264:12 268:7 269:11 291:22 301:25 310:21 differential 216:13 differently 268:9 difficult 72:14 179:9 205:5 difficulty 256:6,10 dig 152:5 digit 214:14 dilaudid 243:15 244:5,10 246:23 diligence 152:5 164:25 165:3 direct 78:2 168:7 173:23 200:6 237:6 249:21 directed 159:9,10 direction 214:13 316:12
---	---	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[directive - diversion]

Page 18

directive 173:22	226:25 236:15,21	164:21 165:15,22	27:12 28:24 34:13
directly 50:2	239:13 250:17	166:4	57:14,24 83:25
64:15 169:6 199:1	285:23 300:23	dispensed 24:1	84:7,22 120:18
215:17	310:2	30:7 70:19 71:8	251:11,15,17
director 17:6,6	discussions 47:10	74:5 88:9,16	252:24
disagree 22:11	173:19,20 174:17	89:11,16 91:3,19	distributor 23:24
181:9,11,18	disease 52:13	92:6 128:23	24:2,4,21 33:11
182:16 184:24	92:21 122:9 146:8	129:17 130:16,24	34:11 36:5 37:11
185:15 187:2	146:13,19 147:18	143:12 164:5	39:9,13 49:4,20
193:19 195:20	148:12,12 228:8	165:9 305:16,21	50:21 51:11 61:24
201:16,18,24	244:22	307:5	62:9,10 68:7
202:21 205:9	dismay 77:7	dispensing 29:13	70:16 87:13,16
222:5,6 224:18	disorder 11:16	30:19 34:23 97:14	88:8,12,18 89:14
226:1 236:13	47:3 84:25 98:22	109:2 129:23	89:19 90:12 91:1
252:20 280:14	98:24 114:23	130:20 131:23	91:7,18 92:5,10
294:3 310:25	117:13 118:13	132:1,14 136:12	114:12 193:8
disbursed 28:20	122:8 149:15,24	181:14 283:6	distributors 24:5
29:1	150:4,7,16 151:6	dispersed 28:6	24:13 25:7 28:5
discharged 244:18	152:8,15,17,20,23	dispute 156:13,15	33:14,18 34:18
246:25	153:11,15 154:5	156:24 236:4	35:9,17 36:11,16
discipline 100:11	154:15 156:16	disrupted 252:18	37:18,24 48:24
disciplined 103:24	157:7,8 158:4,10	disseminate 66:9	68:16 69:24 70:3
discontinued	158:24 180:25	disseminated	70:7,12 81:3,12,20
165:20	181:3 187:14	25:25 110:24	81:23 84:18 85:10
discontinuing	197:17,20 198:4	292:7	86:6 89:9 91:10
190:24	201:3 223:11	dissolved 244:20	91:13 92:2 125:20
discovered 77:7	227:8,11,20 228:8	distant 211:22	192:3 193:4
discovering	228:10,22 229:8	distinct 194:1,12	258:15 274:9
209:25	229:10,14,17,23	195:6 199:23	292:10 303:9
discrepancy 249:3	230:1 233:2	313:12	district 20:9,24
249:3	234:12 235:19,20	distinction 194:4	disulfiram 85:1
discuss 93:10	236:3 242:2,3,15	194:19 195:14	diverge 225:12
96:24,25 213:25	245:2,24 282:11	262:23 290:20	diversion 28:2,8
247:19 300:12	282:13	distribute 35:9	28:15,16 33:12
308:8	disorders 17:21	distributed 23:25	38:22 39:8,17
discussed 132:18	146:21 149:5	86:22 104:22,25	52:21 71:2 72:6
183:12 234:25	150:1 155:10	105:2	72:17,19 87:7,23
245:15	229:3,5,25 235:22	distributing 34:23	87:23 88:3,13
discussing 98:9	235:24	193:6	90:2,10,11 92:15
discussion 46:24	dispense 30:8,25	distribution 25:11	95:3,7,8,9,24,25
95:14 140:11	50:20 92:22 143:8	25:20 26:15 27:3	96:3,5,9 97:7,17

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[diversion - double]

Page 19

97:19,23 98:7,9,11 117:16 181:20 182:10 183:20 210:5,6,13,15,16 210:22 211:16,18 211:21,21 212:13 212:14,20,22,25 213:1,6,10,12,19 213:23 214:1,5,15 214:17 216:8,11 216:24 217:8,12 217:15,19 218:1,8 218:11,12,16,21 219:3,9 220:17 221:20 222:3 283:8,12,15 divert 72:4 diverted 51:23 52:2,4,4,5,8,11 53:10 71:1 87:3 87:15 95:20 210:21,24 250:2 diverting 75:4 95:13 96:19 98:15 216:4 221:14 diving 167:25 division 95:10 194:16 doctor 39:22 40:3 45:11 46:10,18 47:17 48:8 54:1,3 54:21,23 70:21 71:2,9,15 72:12 73:3 74:5,10 75:15 76:9 82:20 82:25 86:14 87:25 100:16 109:18 112:2 114:18 116:22 121:24 123:17,25 124:6 139:22 155:3	159:17 167:7 182:7,9 190:20 206:20 207:8 227:13,17 230:11 231:3,5,24 233:3,5 250:8 251:10 257:19 258:19 259:5 262:3 263:14 264:17 265:1 270:5 272:2 272:8,16 294:24 295:12,21 296:23 297:11 314:12 doctor's 33:23 85:13 89:11 94:13 100:13 112:24 230:18 doctors 31:22,25 32:6,7 39:16 40:2 40:6,7,19,22 44:22 47:6 48:3 53:9 54:22 58:18 59:24 63:7 64:1 65:2 66:12 71:22 72:22 73:12,20,22 74:1 76:16,19 77:1,1 81:4 82:12,13 84:7,23 85:11 86:7 94:15 99:8 99:11,14 100:9,11 102:2,17 103:3,11 103:19,22,24 105:8,24 106:11 109:7 110:18 111:19,23 112:5,7 112:10,15,15,20 113:4 138:5 141:25 142:5,21 159:21,23 160:1,5 163:24 170:13 173:4,20 174:16	174:17 175:6,13 183:13 194:8,14 196:7 198:11 205:15 206:7 207:1,5 237:9 243:20,23 244:2 269:20,21 272:9 278:24 279:23 295:23 305:5 306:6 document 59:14 59:18 67:16,18 126:19 127:3 154:21,25 156:18 206:19 257:6,13 258:14 260:9 261:7 266:3 273:14,14,16,19 276:19,21 277:2 277:20 279:21,21 280:8,10,11,15 286:19 288:8 289:14,17,18,21 289:22 290:16 298:17,18 299:1,5 299:11 314:1,3,6,8 314:11 documentation 57:5 280:5 documented 306:25 documents 36:15 36:18 66:22,23 67:11,22 68:6 128:10 129:21 256:14 275:10,19 276:13,16,23 277:15,16,24 278:3,4,19,20 279:25 286:19,22 286:24 287:2,22	287:24 288:8,14 288:18,22 289:1,5 289:9 298:12 doing 48:16 94:23 106:9 164:25 224:10 241:7 304:13 dollar 37:14,19 38:2,2 241:18 domain 37:17 191:25 don 15:4 donald 3:5 door 111:5 doorstep 214:21 dopamine 203:7 dosage 28:6,9 230:18 261:2 263:23 dosages 203:10 261:21 264:1 dose 44:24 45:21 45:22 96:15 105:17 106:12 152:1 186:2 189:2 189:2 196:3 200:15,17 225:18 225:19 230:1,4,9 230:10,11 231:14 231:15 235:17 236:1 249:6 268:22 doses 46:2 83:4 106:15 140:3 196:5 200:19 206:1,12 229:21 246:24 249:11 298:4 double 214:14 284:14 299:20 311:11
---	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[dr - efficient]

Page 20

dr 11:10,14 13:13 16:14 20:24 22:16 46:9 55:18 67:6 78:5 84:21 90:25 97:4 123:16 126:22 127:10,14 166:7,18 175:16 190:20 251:4 268:18 270:15 271:8 272:23 273:25 275:10 278:13 279:20 280:18,23 281:16 283:17 285:16 286:6 290:15 301:2 309:23 310:6 314:20 draw 257:12 290:20 drink 241:12 drives 37:3 driving 133:15 231:10 drs 102:22,25 drug 9:12 15:23 30:15 58:18 69:19 69:20 77:5,9,21,23 77:24 80:6 82:19 86:15 92:24 93:3 95:11,11 96:12,17 101:11 104:18 117:17 118:2 120:20 121:3 132:8,9 134:16,24 153:21 201:15 210:1,1 213:21 216:12,13,17,20 216:21 224:14 231:23,23 238:25 239:5 267:11	drugs 33:14,15,18 33:21,24 34:22,24 35:2,9 77:22 87:3 88:10,19 117:23 119:17 121:3,13 121:17,17 140:5 171:17 181:15 201:12,13 231:16 231:17 259:15 302:4 dsm 11:16 149:3 149:16,21,25 151:12 154:3,5,7 154:25 155:2 156:3,11 194:17 195:12,15 dual 17:8 due 26:7 29:2 74:3 85:13 87:15 139:8 152:4 164:25 165:3 220:1 222:2 duped 58:18 76:20 140:12 141:14,20 141:22,25 142:1,5 163:25 175:1 duragesic 251:8 254:24 271:10,18 duration 130:25 140:3 186:2 189:2 206:13 225:18 229:22 230:1,20 231:14,15 236:1 248:7 249:11 298:5 dying 35:24 244:4 dynamic 112:2 e e 10:1 29:15,20 eager 107:22 112:1	earlier 41:8,9 56:18 57:12 58:14 58:23 94:24 128:17 132:18 135:11 138:10 143:5 145:19 149:23 152:6 211:14 251:11 256:13 273:22 274:24 282:14 292:14 early 17:21 31:13 45:3 60:2 62:25 65:13 75:10,21 79:14 80:1 93:4 104:2 213:3 216:21 227:15,17 241:7 260:17 276:10 304:14 easier 42:13 easily 57:3 76:9 280:15 easy 75:22 76:7 124:24 217:14 251:22 econometrics 169:12,16 economic 124:23 125:1,12,16 economist 125:5 ed 14:12 30:23 127:16 edition 149:5,18 edlund 225:16 233:23 234:1,2,7 234:14,22 235:2 235:15,25 236:7 educate 64:23 76:16 306:6 educated 93:19 94:16 223:8	232:24 educating 30:17 135:23 136:3 197:9 222:17 223:14,21 306:14 education 60:18 60:21,25 61:1,6,8 63:21 68:25 70:2 95:1 142:3,9,18 151:25 152:2 210:21 223:9 253:12 289:19,25 educational 17:15 109:3 290:12 292:7 edward 5:16 effect 77:17 110:4 119:2 122:11 137:16 168:2 195:21 196:3 242:6,8 243:17 245:16,19,20,21 245:25 252:3 253:5 effective 94:11 112:4 164:1,2 165:21 187:6 228:21 283:20 284:4 306:11 effectively 302:21 effects 190:23 203:15 313:6,17 efficacy 32:20 37:4 64:10 69:3 140:14 153:5 188:22 189:25 263:5 265:9 266:25 efficient 23:24 33:10 34:6,7,11 35:7,14 56:19
---	---	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[efficient - er]

Page 21

57:11,14,24 58:1 251:10,15,18 efficiently 84:3 effort 79:21 139:23 efforts 36:22 66:7 168:3 179:8 271:12,13,13 276:1 290:11 egregious 207:3 306:25 ehsan 4:14 10:11 14:10,10 251:4,6 251:19 252:21 254:6 255:19,24 256:21 259:3,15 259:24 262:7,20 263:4 265:6 268:8 269:8 270:14,23 271:3,8,25 272:7 272:16 eight 239:25 240:2 240:2 either 39:7 52:6 75:3 130:1 134:3 137:22 140:8 164:18 165:6 195:15 229:2 271:18 280:20,20 301:14 el 8:15 electronic 93:14 elicit 198:11 eliciting 121:14 eligible 107:24 108:9 ellis 8:4 14:22 286:9 else's 36:2 email 237:22 238:5,12,14	embarcadero 7:17 emcarter 5:20 emergency 111:5 emergent 83:21 eminent 147:4 emphasized 165:17 employee 160:8 employees 128:13 employment 169:21 enabled 23:25 enabling 206:19 encompass 268:7 encounter 256:6 281:16,21 282:24 encountered 96:3 160:2 212:5 encourage 111:15 encouragement 148:23 encouraging 103:2 endangerment 26:7 endeavoring 141:18 ended 43:2 endo 7:3,3 14:17 14:17 272:24 273:2,3,8,11 274:7 274:11 275:15,20 275:22 276:4,16 276:16,23 277:3,5 277:15,20 278:3,4 278:15,20 279:7 279:21 280:2,10 280:15,20,25 281:5,9,13 endo's 274:2,5,17 275:5 277:12 279:8	endorse 102:9 112:6 189:15 190:8,10 228:24 253:1 endorsed 253:1 endorses 231:1 endorsing 102:12 ends 120:10 enduring 110:15 enforcement 52:14 160:16 engage 93:12 99:24 117:5 engaged 76:21 82:20 117:15 208:13,18 211:22 213:23 306:24,25 engaging 73:9,15 93:1 170:14 189:17 193:1 207:3 209:2 253:6 england 58:7,15 59:23 60:5 64:14 enormous 153:5 197:23 204:16 enrollees 114:25 115:3 116:6 ensuing 66:5 ensure 30:11 61:4 73:4 92:24 93:5 107:21 130:15 132:20 133:7,21 134:5 entered 16:18 78:16 252:6 entire 137:16 190:1 209:6 entirely 46:3 187:17 255:12,16 255:20,23	entities 9:3 15:2 177:6,10,19 301:22 302:4,11 303:1,17 308:25 309:4 entitled 237:1,3 289:17 entity 217:10 301:10 epidemic 24:16 25:22 26:17 28:25 33:7 34:12,14 74:25 76:25 78:3 80:3,7,12 81:15 106:4,24 107:11 109:7,19 117:21 124:22 129:5 133:16,17 135:4 141:1 161:6 162:6 171:13 174:24 177:2,6,18 178:3 178:21 179:2,19 180:5,17 183:22 214:20 246:11 251:23 252:9 274:10 293:21 equal 229:2,19 equally 143:4 equals 217:15 equipped 220:3 equivalence 248:3 297:18 equivalent 29:11 29:23 258:3,5 equivalents 130:24 131:3,3,5 er 263:16 264:22 266:12 267:4,10 267:19 273:3 289:18
--	--	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[errata - exist]

Page 22

errata 43:5 error 208:18 216:16 errors 209:19,20 209:23 especially 38:11 38:16,20 40:12 74:11 165:16 181:24 183:21 258:24 esq 3:5,6,7,16 4:5 5:5,6,16 6:5,15 7:7,16 8:5,14 9:5 9:14 essence 292:12 essential 153:1 essentially 279:12 establish 107:25 established 263:10 estate 225:2 estimate 21:6 71:5 145:23 199:12 200:23 estimated 199:6 200:22 estimates 72:17 et 29:8 105:18 111:7 187:10 204:20 265:10 307:14 europe 155:15 european 155:17 155:22 156:6 evade 173:23 evaluate 150:17 evaluating 150:16 197:1 evaluation 150:21 170:15 305:1 evening 67:10	event 48:20 61:17 62:22 281:18,23 282:4,22 283:2,3 283:10 events 62:6 everybody 82:11 83:22 91:11 evidence 16:7 20:20 45:17 46:5 51:25 61:5 80:22 81:9 82:8 96:17 96:21,23 105:16 109:19 111:9 114:5 117:8 119:10 124:4,16 130:13 134:23 139:4,6 140:15 141:2 143:11 150:23 153:3 159:3 168:9 170:15 175:2 182:3 184:3 185:22 187:19,20 187:25 188:1,2,13 188:17 189:3,9 203:20 204:23 222:9,19 223:21 232:5 238:7 265:9 265:18 266:24,25 267:8 283:19,23 290:14 292:8,11 298:7 299:7,14,23 evidenced 293:16 293:17 evolution 63:10,14 63:18 65:12 exacerbates 117:12 exacerbation 242:14	exact 21:5 57:3 61:18 65:21 71:13 81:18 115:13 exactly 18:18 41:15 115:24 122:17 139:15 exam 228:25 examination 10:6 16:13 127:13 167:17 251:3 272:22 286:5 301:1 310:5 316:10 examiner 157:16 examiner's 158:8 example 30:15 36:10,11 44:23 69:10 72:7 83:11 84:24 85:10 86:6 86:11 87:7,8,24 88:4 95:10 96:12 105:15 107:23 175:14 178:1 180:23 187:9 189:5 190:2 192:16 197:12,14 209:24 210:4,5 211:24 213:15 216:2,5,20 217:25 218:18 219:8,14 220:15 221:17 224:15 242:4,7 243:16,22 249:25 250:6 258:14 278:11 292:6 293:19 examples 207:23 211:6 249:15 278:2,10 exception 174:23 315:6	excess 256:3 283:24 excessive 22:25 23:8,13 excluded 168:1,17 excluding 168:11 169:1 excuse 25:15 41:21 52:10 99:8 121:12 126:4 exercise 139:5,19 141:19 204:21 exercising 139:7 141:13 exhibit 11:5,7,9,12 11:14,16,18,19,20 11:21,23,24 12:1,2 13:5,7 16:23 18:7 18:11,15 66:15 67:3,5,18 68:3 78:5,7 119:25 120:6,14 126:1,4,5 126:5,6,14,20,22 144:19 154:3,5 236:19 237:1 238:18 239:18 250:18,20,22,24 256:19,23,24,25 257:7 260:2 261:8 263:13,20 264:6 264:18 265:24 273:18,19,21,23 275:12,20 276:3 276:17,24 278:5 285:24 286:1,11 288:10 289:15 298:9,19 314:2,9 exhibits 11:1 exist 163:4,5 227:5 262:13
--	--	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[existed - family]

Page 23

existed 106:7 existence 191:13 235:23 expect 150:8 expected 33:19,22 expenses 144:24 experience 26:5 42:5 45:18 54:1 67:23 68:1 77:15 96:3 113:3,3 119:12 122:23 142:10 159:14 169:21 171:7 185:20 190:13 206:12 211:17 212:7,24 232:6 268:19 269:10,12 269:14 276:7,8 289:2 296:23 304:9 experiences 159:23 experiencing 39:10 63:18 expert 11:7 13:7 16:19 18:1,12 19:11,19 20:23 56:3 78:17 89:8 91:24 136:24 166:16 168:1,18 171:2 254:17 expert's 314:4 expertise 24:9,17 25:14,17,19 44:22 114:15 135:18 168:6,8 171:9 269:21 experts 20:20 21:22 81:18 91:9 92:3 113:13,19 238:1 247:10	267:16 274:1,15 274:24 expires 315:25 explain 79:9 219:11,12 220:15 221:17 228:6 explained 96:16 explanation 19:1 40:21 exploited 180:9 231:11 exposed 115:3 122:21 124:11 162:20 196:1 234:9 278:23 exposure 28:3 78:3 123:4,9,11 187:8,10 227:4 254:9 298:2 express 96:25 expressed 75:18 76:19 164:15 expressing 65:6 expressly 133:2,3 182:1 extended 225:23 225:25 226:5,11 244:24 264:25 266:16,20 extends 267:1 extent 75:1 135:2 137:4,8 139:20 140:1 149:9 151:9 168:8 177:5 178:1 178:20 179:1,17 180:14 277:15,19 312:15 314:6 external 148:18,22 280:16 extra 152:4 256:20	extrapolate 124:9 extreme 32:8 extremely 62:25 71:5 90:1 195:5 eye 36:1 f facilities 87:9 facility 204:18 facing 59:6 103:25 fact 35:23 36:3 37:2 49:15 50:12 50:14,17 64:8 73:10 74:10 77:12 93:21 109:18 111:11 112:9 146:18 152:2,19 163:17,25 164:2 179:11,24 181:4 191:5 193:5 194:20 196:1 210:2 217:15 218:24 220:3 228:20 230:6 259:1 260:5 273:10 291:21 297:6 314:4 factor 33:6,9,10 33:10 116:13 117:21 133:15 137:15 180:3,5 225:17 227:21,23 227:24 228:3 234:13 factors 77:20 151:24 179:5,11 179:11,23 227:4,7 228:12,14,17,19 228:24 229:9,9,16 229:23 230:3 232:7 234:8,24 235:8,11,16,23	facts 51:24 221:9 faculty 17:22,23 209:14 fail 134:4 139:19 failed 36:5 130:14 134:10,24 137:8 137:24 139:5 168:9 219:6,17 221:12 failure 25:20 26:15 27:3 fair 21:22 41:7 47:5 127:4 130:19 137:7 141:17 147:10,12 148:18 149:24 150:6 152:15,18 161:21 164:13 176:10,17 178:4 183:6 201:9 268:10 270:14 277:11 287:1 faith 32:14 161:23 162:4,5,14,21,25 164:6 falls 156:5 false 43:8 63:24 70:14 127:20 217:12 266:21 familiar 24:12 27:21,23 34:1 37:21 100:22 107:13 110:8 135:19 142:2,17 166:18 171:15 266:8 273:8,12 297:5 299:17 306:23 familiarity 82:24 family 40:6 75:23 93:12 96:25 97:12 189:16,17 190:4,9
--	---	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[family - foregoing]

Page 24

190:10,21 192:6 198:12 211:10 217:2 224:13 225:20 227:10 231:17,23 far 20:2,6,7,19 56:11,25 129:23 235:22 265:13 fashion 284:15 fashioned 139:7 fatal 256:2 father 246:23 favor 184:12 285:2 fda 35:2,4 247:6,8 247:10 252:22 253:2 267:3,9,10 267:13,15,17,17 274:25 275:1,5,8 305:14,20 fear 109:9 311:7 311:15,20 312:3 312:12 federal 19:17 20:8 20:11,14,24,25 21:7 28:10 41:4 41:16,23 42:1,7,15 42:22 43:7 68:14 68:18 federation 69:1 70:10 100:22,25 101:1,5,8,11,15,18 101:24 102:1 103:1,10,18 104:9 104:21 105:6,23 106:10,19,22 107:6,9 202:17 275:24 federation's 102:9 102:14,16 104:6	fee 109:3 feel 36:23 53:3 97:23 114:2 142:22 175:10 220:20 221:23 265:17 266:21,23 feels 112:6 feet 244:12 fell 99:9 fellowship 17:7,21 felt 79:8 96:4 97:18 217:9 fentanyl 116:9,14 116:18 117:1 121:25 122:16 123:18 124:1 200:3 243:4,8 244:6 251:8 252:14 254:11 287:13,15 303:25 304:19 309:14 fentora 303:19 304:6,10,17 309:9 309:10,20 fewer 74:19 field 169:22,25 190:1 fifth 110:19,23 149:5,18 275:24 312:21,24 figure 50:3 165:23 170:13 192:13 figured 151:11 filed 13:16 files 128:10 fill 48:24 49:3,19 82:1,7,15 114:25 164:24 filled 48:14 70:21 71:9,15 72:20 82:2,11,16 87:8	88:4,8,14 90:12 139:21 163:7 164:5 filling 87:24 140:2 144:8,12,16 fills 88:22 final 307:20 finance 8:3 14:23 286:9 financial 256:10 financially 62:5 find 29:5 76:8 95:23 96:7 97:4 97:10 157:22 234:19 finding 74:17 75:1 89:16 91:3 118:22 147:8 finds 188:23 fine 154:23 264:13 finish 61:2,3 235:4 finished 235:1 282:8 firm 13:21 286:8 310:7 first 19:18 32:11 50:1 51:19 60:24 76:4 80:17 83:4 87:7 101:18 105:10 120:5 123:4,8,11 138:12 154:14 156:4,24 158:14 213:6,25 214:21 221:7 233:12 240:10,20 240:24 241:8 245:1 260:4 263:15 264:18 269:16 fit 304:10	five 76:14 116:10 220:9 239:25 244:9 288:7 flesh 244:12 flip 239:21 flips 240:2 floor 4:15 9:15 florida 9:7 flu 241:1 fly 56:7 focus 221:11 focused 161:9 focusing 105:22 267:18 fold 84:12 117:6 131:6 folks 239:5 follow 22:16 53:5 53:7 55:24 110:5 128:18 135:11 145:23 followed 60:6 94:6 117:11 149:21 246:17 following 80:13 108:11,14 132:18 follows 121:16 269:5 followup 190:19 196:12 footnote 120:15 121:16 footnotes 237:21 force 171:24 172:1 172:8,12,19,21,24 202:16 forces 172:10 231:9 foregoing 315:3 316:6,13
---	---	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[foremost - garguilo]

Page 25

foremost 51:19	182:13,21 183:14	160:13,18,22,25	frequently 33:1
forgot 96:19	184:1,11,23	178:10 197:4	50:8 58:21 224:10
form 16:18 20:17	186:18 187:23	207:11 275:11	friend 76:7 117:17
21:2,9,20 24:11	188:16 189:11	277:3,7,11,16	friends 75:23 76:1
27:5 29:17 31:7	191:1,21 192:20	forms 261:2	211:10
32:17 33:25 34:10	194:3,15 195:2,23	263:23 264:1	front 78:5 119:22
35:11 37:12,20	199:18 201:8,21	273:4 287:6	171:11 183:3
39:12 41:11 42:10	202:4,12,25	formulary 179:1	219:1 239:24
42:18 45:13 46:12	203:17 204:13	179:18 230:22	243:23 269:21
46:21 47:8 48:9	205:8 206:5,10,23	formulation 85:7	frontal 148:25
49:6,11,25 51:2,14	208:14 212:11	86:3 225:2,25	fueled 33:7
51:24 52:23 53:11	214:18 215:1,6,16	266:16	fulfill 134:1,4,10
53:17 54:4,10	216:10 217:17,17	formulations	137:24
56:12 57:16,22,25	218:6,9,22 219:10	224:21 226:6	fulfilled 133:6,20
59:7 67:20 70:22	219:19 220:11,24	forth 149:16	fulfilling 34:18
71:11,18 72:25	221:5 222:18	275:11 316:7	full 118:11 150:17
73:16 74:7 75:7	223:12 225:8	foster 161:7	239:22 244:10,10
79:4 80:4 81:6,16	226:9 228:15	found 28:2 115:6	316:13
82:3,17 85:16	230:15 231:25	118:20 119:16	fully 72:16 232:20
86:18 87:22 88:11	234:6 235:13	244:24 265:11	function 190:2
88:20 89:1 92:12	238:6 246:6	278:9	284:20
94:7 95:5 96:1	247:18 250:3	foundation 190:4	functional 203:15
97:8,25 98:16	251:16 252:19	founded 300:8	functioning
99:17 100:1	254:4 255:17,21	four 84:12 110:14	232:24
113:24 114:13	259:12,20 262:6	131:6 165:16	funded 102:23
115:21 116:15	262:16,24 265:4	239:25	funding 104:18
117:2 119:20	268:4 269:2	framed 164:22	271:13 291:4
123:9,11,19 124:2	271:22 272:3	188:11	314:4
124:25 133:24	276:5 278:7,17	framework	funds 107:24
135:9 143:2 145:9	279:10 280:13	149:15,25 154:9	further 127:10
146:7 147:1 148:4	287:15 288:24	francisco 1:15	313:22 315:4
148:6,19 150:11	289:11 295:15	2:15 3:9 6:17 7:18	316:16
151:16 153:12	296:11 297:2,14	13:1,20	furtherance 309:5
161:25 162:16	297:25 299:16	free 36:11,17,19	furthermore
163:10,14 164:7	301:14 302:17	36:22 105:3	152:22
165:10 168:13,19	303:2,21 305:10	186:13 256:15	g
172:15 173:11,15	307:8 310:12,17	257:9,20 258:3,5	game 21:22
174:8 175:9,18	310:24 311:9,21	258:11 261:10,24	gap 190:12
176:11 177:8	312:13 313:9	262:11	garguilo 11:6 13:5
178:5,17,23 179:3	forming 67:13,16	frequency 87:25	16:22 78:16
179:20 180:7,18	68:2 149:12 160:9		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[gateway - group]

Page 26

gateway 245:16,17	gist 86:8	226:22 236:16	167:20 185:21
gather 93:12	give 16:8 37:13	239:10 241:12	203:19 210:21
96:21 151:1,21	45:7 51:3,12	250:12 267:24	222:11 223:14
gathered 159:24	76:25,25 84:24	275:2 285:18	240:6 251:4 286:6
276:13	87:7 115:13	299:12 313:24	286:7 301:2
gears 146:3	123:20 124:15,18	god 16:9	307:12 310:6
161:21 181:7	162:10 178:18,24	goes 21:25 186:22	goods 64:10
general 3:15 15:9	180:24 189:5	233:1	gotten 192:13
15:14 36:22 46:13	207:7 212:3,6,8	going 16:22 18:6	221:16
59:2 82:25 94:8	234:15 257:23	19:13 22:16 28:23	government 178:2
106:21 140:25	261:23	34:8 51:3 53:1,7	178:15
147:12 148:16	given 39:16 45:21	55:10,13 79:24	gradually 79:7
157:5 165:2	107:5 113:8 115:1	90:20 92:25	graduated 17:18
176:16 226:16	115:4 118:24	113:19 123:18	282:8
227:17,24 274:13	137:5 140:18,22	127:1,5 131:9	graduating 17:17
290:4 306:13	164:9,9 165:2	154:2 167:11	grain 149:7
generally 41:1	182:20 183:21	193:9 196:5	grandma's 117:18
92:15 105:8,25	184:9,21 205:7	201:16 206:2	grandparent's
309:11	221:17 228:12	215:21 216:15	72:8
generations 32:19	230:7,9,22 231:1	217:23 219:9	grant 9:21 13:21
165:18,24	233:21 234:18	222:14 226:23	granted 267:11
generic 9:3 15:2	244:17,21 245:14	232:2 236:17	granting 100:6
171:16,21,23,24	246:1 258:11	239:11 241:17	gray 7:15 14:20
171:25 172:3,4,6,8	262:25 265:20	247:2 250:15	great 189:1 191:17
172:14,19 200:11	269:23 277:4,8	252:17 255:5	202:13 215:7
273:4 301:14	giving 58:20 77:11	260:1 261:6	222:15 240:14
302:12,14,20,22	132:24 211:8	263:12 264:13	242:7 243:16,22
302:25 303:16	221:15 237:4	272:18 285:21	308:17
generics 172:1,18	glaring 150:24	288:9 300:21	greater 140:21
173:1	glass 241:6	309:25 314:12,15	235:18
geographic 29:12	global 299:19	good 13:9 16:14	greatest 225:17
34:14 39:18 54:19	go 13:25 59:18	16:15 32:14,22	greatly 202:21
140:18 294:19	72:3 74:15,23	83:6 105:19	253:19 269:19,24
getting 72:7 76:1	75:9 76:9 84:9	109:19 112:7,10	291:12
77:5 83:16 189:16	88:23 97:15	112:15 115:5	green 243:14
192:23,24,25	117:25 121:7,24	117:8 127:14,15	ground 217:25
198:3 268:14	124:6 127:1,2	138:24 139:5,7	group 84:13
284:16	146:10 187:13	147:7 156:12	102:21 176:17
ghertner 29:8	191:17 193:8	157:2 161:23	186:20 242:9,10
gimlet 237:2	194:10 198:23	162:4,5,14,21,25	284:13 298:14,22
	201:17 222:4	164:6 167:18,19	299:3,9,15

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[groups - high]

Page 27

groups 284:13 grow 79:7 growing 63:19 74:24 75:6,8 76:5 79:1,5,6,6,17,17 79:18,19 80:3,11 80:15,23 117:15 growth 79:9 guess 47:13 85:17 168:22 171:22 268:5 280:7 guide 102:5 104:14 161:12 305:14,20 306:2 guideline 105:7 guidelines 83:3 101:15,19 102:10 102:12,14,17 103:2 104:6 105:24 106:3,6,23 107:2 138:11,16 138:21 275:25 308:23 guides 305:24 307:4 gynecologic 77:3 gynecologist 94:24	257:6 264:6 265:25 289:15 298:18 handing 67:3 238:21 hands 78:4 handwriting 240:7,14 handwritten 11:19 238:18 happen 30:3 31:5 241:11 happened 65:12 242:19 happening 195:17 204:4 214:3 217:22 218:12 220:6 happens 52:18 79:7 88:9,19 89:10,15 91:2,18 happy 270:11 276:20 277:2 289:6 308:9 hard 18:17 58:19 71:5,19 115:22 195:12 243:22 283:11 hardest 124:22 harm 29:2,14 30:13 46:3 75:1 97:17,23 132:23 133:8 147:7 162:18,24 163:3 165:25 185:21 186:8 187:8 203:24 222:2 306:21 harmed 30:7 38:24 39:20 72:5 82:10 97:17	128:22 129:16 130:16 192:25 302:24 303:15 309:19 harmful 185:19 194:9 195:7 hashish 121:18 hayward 307:14 head 79:3 86:1 87:1 168:21 199:8 220:12 262:2 heading 154:13 health 7:3 14:17 30:22 83:21 110:13 116:2 118:2,23,24 136:18 137:2,24 180:14 183:25 184:1 193:3 202:7 218:14 227:25 235:18 284:21 healthcare 45:15 46:1 64:9,17 74:16 107:14 108:5 119:14 140:12,25 149:10 153:1 183:4 204:14,15,18 209:6 228:13,16 283:5 292:7 healthy 152:1 244:3 hear 208:8 226:15 heard 80:19,25 132:2,4 174:15 189:3 206:16 304:3 305:2 hearing 56:8 heart 110:13 111:7	heating 244:24 heavily 84:3,5 161:7 179:7 230:21 heavy 89:4 hehsan 4:18 heimann 2:14 held 13:19 61:15 61:16 help 16:9 73:20 80:18 81:10,14 111:25 148:14 181:15 192:8 215:9 223:10 helped 80:15 helpers 111:24 helpful 48:22 73:11 185:19 helping 44:17 46:1 204:5 209:11 helps 257:21 henceforth 237:12 heroin 116:9,14,17 117:1,7 118:4,10 118:13,15,17 119:3,7,17 120:8 120:23 121:11,24 122:15,15,19,21 122:25 123:4,9,13 123:18,25 240:21 240:23,24 241:2,3 241:9,11,15,16 242:10,11,13 243:21 244:7 246:8,17 252:13 hide 36:1 hiemann 3:4 13:20 15:5 16:1 high 38:20 39:6 53:22 87:25 92:19 93:17 94:1 103:3
h h 5:17 habit 241:18 hallucinogens 121:18 hand 16:5 256:18 257:14 260:1 263:12 264:2 288:9 290:23 298:8 handbook 59:12 handed 18:10 125:25 126:5 236:25 239:17			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[high - illicitly]

Page 28

105:18 106:11,12 106:15 107:21 115:18 118:6 140:3 152:13 153:16 157:8 191:17 206:1,12 218:12 230:10 231:17 232:24,24 235:17 244:18 246:24 249:6 higher 196:3,5 214:9 225:18 229:3,9,21 235:19 highest 200:15,17 200:18 highlight 40:13 307:13 highlighted 154:12 highlights 11:21 11:24 250:20,24 highly 1:9 2:8 34:22,24 37:1 112:17 227:18,19 hijacked 209:6 hipaa 51:8 historical 255:4 historically 108:5 history 83:18 118:22 122:9 132:15 150:21 151:11 153:3 158:20 166:19 197:11 198:12,15 198:17 215:12 224:14 225:20 227:8,10,13,15,22 229:3,5 231:22,22 231:23 232:25 245:14 246:2	hit 124:22 hold 103:16 171:2 246:4 holders 135:17 homology 194:23 hon 11:5 13:5 honest 216:16 hooked 58:19 hope 4:15 147:2,3 147:5 251:21 hopkins 64:21 hospice 147:4 hospital 111:5 112:12,12 230:22 230:24 242:16 hospitalizations 29:10,22 hospitals 81:14,24 81:25 82:7 107:20 107:22 108:2,22 109:2 110:5 112:9 houman 4:14 14:10 251:5 hour 19:20,23,25 55:10 144:21 170:16 hourly 19:22 145:7 hours 56:15 house 88:24 hubbard 6:6 huge 54:18 240:21 244:6 huh 88:17 120:12 120:22,22,25 121:2,6,9 144:22 148:21 155:12,20 155:25 167:24 184:15 205:20 221:2 234:4 238:24 266:14	284:17 300:14 humanities 17:17 hundred 212:17 212:18 220:9 241:18 248:18 hundreds 162:12 288:18 hydrocodone 28:12 70:19,25 71:8 200:3 273:5 301:14 hydromorphone 195:22 273:5 hyperalgesia 46:7 hypnotic 140:5 hypothetical 82:4 191:2 221:6,18,22 231:13 232:1,23 233:5 hypothetically 145:5 222:12 hypotheticals 141:2	285:25 286:2 identified 11:4 18:14 67:11 128:6 308:18 identify 14:5 18:10 26:23 42:15 58:2,14,23 60:13 69:14 70:14 91:14 120:5 127:20 172:7,18 206:20 207:7 249:20 255:15 271:17 272:7,9 280:18,23 281:8,12 287:8,21 295:20 296:3,8,13 296:18 298:12 300:2 302:7 307:23,24 308:11 identifying 197:6 207:23 249:15,25 250:6 identities 158:2 ii 44:12,25 60:9 103:9 258:7,10,12 iii 87:2 90:11 illegal 71:16,20 117:23 153:20 210:25 217:12,15 illegally 252:7 illicit 116:17 119:17 121:3,13 121:16,17 122:16 137:19 231:23 245:5 252:13,13 252:23 253:10,20 253:24 254:1 255:8 illicitly 252:6 253:13 254:11,14 254:15,18
		i	
		i.e. 231:7 268:24 iatrogenic 165:25 194:19 iatrogenically 253:23 ibuprofen 185:25 icu 244:9 idea 109:11 110:22,24 141:12 156:12 238:8 identifiable 235:23 identification 13:6 13:8 67:7 120:1 126:23 154:6 236:20 238:19 250:19,21,23,25	

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[illinois - independently]

Page 29

illinois 6:7 8:7	148:11 183:16,24	include 29:5 41:8	39:3 84:12,15
illness 149:8	190:12 198:6	121:17 157:21	116:13 131:6
224:15 232:25	217:21 225:9	198:12,15,17,20	140:16,18 177:14
illustrates 115:15	245:4,8	228:9 242:5 245:4	180:9 245:8
immediate 112:6	importantly	245:15 246:1,12	248:10 253:19
190:9 217:1	106:13 229:15	277:20,24 278:1	297:12,17,19,21
303:25 305:3	244:15 258:14	included 23:23	297:23
306:4	imported 253:25	41:23 130:6 157:9	increased 26:6,8
immediately 96:24	impressions	216:12 245:17,19	28:3 29:2 33:6
97:20	284:11	276:17,24 277:23	75:22 77:17 78:2
imminently	improper 183:13	278:1,5 280:6	80:8 84:16,17
150:25	194:14 196:8	302:1	91:25 116:10
immunity 94:19	207:14 271:20	includes 84:14	119:6 131:2,4,9,13
impact 28:24	improperly 250:2	126:16 149:25	131:17 140:19
83:25 84:22 91:25	improve 111:14	151:23 154:8	224:13,19 225:4
112:19 113:22	improvement	192:1,1,2,2,3,4,5,6	225:15,24 226:4
114:3 173:3 179:2	190:13,14	including 25:25	229:22,25 245:11
292:18,24 293:12	inaccuracy 216:17	29:3 82:12,13	245:11 248:2,4,9
294:9,16 307:19	inaccurate 62:24	84:18 94:9 109:16	248:17 252:9,12
impacted 84:5	63:9 64:3 65:4	110:13 121:18	294:14
85:10 86:7 161:7	189:21 195:1	130:24 140:22	increases 39:18
173:1 272:5	212:9	159:5 161:6 162:6	74:18,18 117:6
impacts 113:10	inadequate 306:5	190:2 197:19	186:1
impaired 83:8	306:8	203:5 205:24	increasing 26:8
imperfect 149:8	inappropriate	206:3 217:2 222:2	35:18,19 80:13
implement 94:21	186:11 206:9	224:14 227:25	91:16 137:18
95:2 104:5 108:22	208:1,5,7,10,23	228:1 235:15	140:5 186:2 189:2
implementation	209:2 271:9	246:11 252:13	230:8 298:4,5
171:3,9	278:16 296:20	253:10 271:15	303:9
implemented	302:25 303:16	272:12 284:22	increasingly 119:5
93:20 94:2 204:18	309:20	294:6 309:14	incredibly 192:10
305:9	inappropriately	income 145:20,24	incremental
implication 77:10	205:17	145:25	186:24
implicitly 108:21	inappropriateness	incomplete 154:21	incurred 185:25
implied 79:6 109:9	208:14	191:1 198:9	186:23 189:1
140:10,20 181:22	incarcerated	221:21 222:25	196:5
implies 47:13	155:9 157:10	inconsistent	independent 27:2
important 30:17	incidence 118:4,6	211:25 264:7	27:6 125:11,15
80:10,11 108:4,5	118:10	incorrect 293:15	293:11,16
118:8,14 124:21	incident 236:3	increase 24:7 29:9	independently
135:23 137:5		29:11,22,23 31:12	253:18

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[index - institution]

Page 30

index 13:17	245:15,17 246:1	infection 242:17	infusion 94:25
indicate 260:22	246:13 253:19	243:11,13	ingesting 38:25
indicated 47:10	278:20 281:2,12	infiltrated 230:24	ingestion 249:21
49:14 116:22	292:19,24 293:5	influence 69:9	inhalants 121:19
145:22 243:1	295:12 296:3,8,13	111:18 181:6	inherent 64:19
259:10,13,19	296:18	275:23 280:17	inhibitor 259:9
260:18 264:22	individual's 140:6	291:11,12 295:17	inhouse 246:24
266:17 304:6	158:20 201:20	303:8 308:8	initial 260:8
indicating 159:5	202:2	influenced 172:5	initially 124:25
256:19 260:2	individualize	179:7,24 202:23	initiate 306:16
261:7 263:13	203:14	230:21 276:8	initiated 98:10
288:10 298:9	individually 158:9	279:8 280:15	initiating 222:10
indication 54:6	individuals 26:7	291:6 295:24	223:1 284:11
83:13 260:24	36:23 72:11 76:10	302:19 309:12	initiation 120:8,19
261:1 264:19	77:10,12 115:12	influx 240:21	inject 241:10
265:2,7,8,17 267:4	118:12 122:24	inform 61:5 74:12	injected 241:6,6
267:9,10,18,25	152:22 153:16	151:20 168:9	244:20 247:1
268:12 290:17	155:9 157:10	219:25 223:3	injecting 244:24
indications 134:17	162:19,20 165:18	informally 65:5	injection 243:11
134:25 259:16	186:21,24 187:13	information 11:22	innocently 34:18
260:16 309:9	188:25 192:24	11:25 41:25 51:17	inpatient 201:14
indicative 158:21	195:13 203:11	62:23 63:8 64:2	input 198:12
indirectly 102:23	207:2,9 220:9,14	65:3 78:20 79:12	inroads 306:23
215:18	222:13 225:15	92:10 93:13	inserts 301:21,24
individual 69:8	234:8,11 245:22	105:19,20,21	302:3
72:9 82:9 91:8	249:15 252:11	135:5 136:10	inside 177:13
92:5 101:2 107:7	280:19,24 284:12	138:17 151:1	179:23 231:9
135:16,20 147:23	298:5 306:24	158:19 197:15	insipidus 255:25
151:7 159:8 173:4	311:6,14,19	207:12 236:1	insisting 186:10
173:8,10 174:1,1,5	312:11	250:21,25 262:23	instance 218:7,17
174:6,10 175:8	induced 46:6	informed 67:21	218:21 220:5,17
182:24 183:23	industry 35:25	92:20 93:18 95:14	246:22
197:1,5,11 202:24	37:5,14,19 38:2,4	96:22 153:2 168:9	instances 137:23
204:11 206:21	38:10 39:5 62:5	171:5,8 203:19	191:3 205:22
207:1 212:12	62:10 66:7 68:13	204:22 209:4	211:7 214:15
213:18 216:19	68:22 69:22 70:1	219:25 228:17	216:7 217:1 280:4
217:3 218:25	70:5,9 76:20 81:8	232:5 265:17	283:6,14
219:3 220:4,23	116:1 177:1,11,17	266:23 307:2	instant 302:2
221:25 228:7,14	179:25 180:6	informing 302:15	instituted 77:4
230:12 232:14	272:11 295:17,25	infrastructure	institution 63:1
242:1,3,4,5,7	308:9	95:2 204:3 215:9	

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[institutions - joint]

Page 31

institutions 108:6 instruct 20:21 21:24 22:10 55:21 instructed 10:19 16:21 instruction 55:25 257:22 instrumental 177:23 insufficient 189:21 189:24 insurance 180:15 230:23 intend 18:15,23 19:1,7 41:9,24 42:8,16 125:21,23 276:15,22 intended 73:20 74:1 119:14 210:9 intense 191:6,19 intensive 224:22 225:6 226:7 intention 64:23 intentional 147:15 intentionally 72:6 72:11 76:11 188:11 intentioned 141:12,17 209:23 interacted 135:21 interactions 30:15 134:16,24 interdisciplinary 97:13 interested 316:18 interesting 181:8 interestingly 76:24 interests 152:4 interface 117:19	interference 14:2 interjected 188:10 intern 44:10 internal 40:7 148:17,22 239:21 279:21,25 280:10 280:15 interpretation 151:20 interpreting 234:1 interrogatory 221:10 interrupt 188:3,4 interrupted 188:9 235:3 interruption 14:3 156:21 226:13,18 226:21 248:14 intertwined 119:9 intervals 93:5 intervene 89:17 91:4 243:23 306:15 intervention 97:21 165:21 214:10 interventions 44:16 interview 159:21 236:25 237:4,18 240:18 interviewed 159:17,20 160:8 160:12,16,20,25 interviewing 239:5 interweave 245:8 interwoven 253:18 intimately 299:17 intoxicated 83:8 83:16 143:7,13	intoxication 59:21 intramuscularly 241:6 intrinsic 195:21 196:4 intro 11:18 236:19 introduced 108:18 invades 98:16 invariably 196:2 invasion 51:4 invented 110:20 invention 202:19 inventory 34:4 invested 209:11 investigate 51:11 89:5 100:9 invisible 231:9 invoice 21:1 invoices 20:24 145:13,17 involuntary 147:11 148:10 involve 39:1 216:25 283:15 291:4 involved 37:6 38:4 44:17 99:19,21 100:5,6 102:11 118:21 139:12 150:9 215:8,15,17 215:18 involvement 42:3 involves 45:20,22 181:23 involving 185:8,12 211:19 iqva 248:16 irrational 109:9 island 145:6 189:7 isolate 173:2,8 174:4 179:9,17,21	292:18,23 isolateable 179:22 isolated 48:20 220:5 221:25 isolation 195:16 258:22 isop 132:2,3 issue 101:18 196:15 264:14 267:14,15 issued 26:19 80:5 issues 274:25 item 257:2,22 313:25 iv 243:4,8 244:5,6 244:10,14
			j
			j 9:14 jama 123:5 294:18 jan 11:20,23 250:18,22 257:4 janssen 4:12 14:11 68:11 251:6 257:15 258:16 259:22 267:11 271:9,12,13 272:1 272:4,4,8,12,13,14 january 1:16 2:17 10:4 13:1,10 16:17 316:21 jerry 11:5 13:5 job 39:13 231:17 232:25 john 5:17 johns 64:21 johnson 4:12,12 14:11,11 251:6,6 joined 17:22 joint 69:2 70:11 107:13,16,18,19 107:22,25 108:3

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[joint - large]

Page 32

108:12,15,16,18 108:20,24 109:25 110:16,20 202:17 230:24 jones 5:15 190:20 jonesday.com 5:20 joranson 102:22 102:25 300:8 journal 58:7,15,15 59:4,23 60:5 64:14 judgement 141:13 268:20 judgment 96:22 98:2 141:19 151:22 152:1 184:2 204:22,22 judicious 253:7 judiciously 76:18 judith 166:7 jump 22:3 juncture 115:23 june 102:22 junior 17:22 63:1 199:25 jury 189:5 197:9 206:3 210:7 219:15 228:6 justice 16:22 78:16 211:20 283:16 justified 26:2 89:4 129:24	kay 7:6 keen 237:9 keep 34:6 244:8 kept 57:4 key 28:2 68:24 69:7,8,14,23 110:21 135:3 keyes 157:20 kicking 237:3 kilogram 29:10,23 kind 36:21 44:14 46:15 60:4 66:9 94:19 95:23 96:23 108:4 109:14 111:23 122:8 147:11 148:9 153:20 165:3 196:12 199:21 200:5 204:2 208:13,18 233:11 299:19 311:3 312:17 313:1,15 313:19 kinds 142:6 199:16 290:12 291:13 kirkland 8:4 14:22 286:9 kirkland.com 8:9 knew 244:2 284:16 know 21:5,10 36:4 37:23 39:9 49:1 53:9 56:5,14,17,23 57:17 60:1 61:18 63:13 64:13 65:19 65:22 71:12 72:16 76:8 77:19 78:16 81:1 82:15 83:14 83:17,19 86:19 87:17 92:13 96:14	96:21 101:9 102:13 104:7 105:2 106:20,20 106:21 107:8,9 112:10 114:2 115:9,25 116:5,8 122:15,17 124:10 124:11 129:25 130:2,10 131:22 132:5,5 133:4,20 136:2 138:15 139:13 142:23,24 143:18,21,23 144:1 145:16,24 147:3 152:5 160:4 160:5,7 161:4 169:5 172:10,20 173:22 193:9 198:1 199:5 207:18 208:11 210:7 211:9,19 213:6,17,20 214:8 214:20 219:1,8,14 238:5 240:14,25 242:10 247:9 254:23 255:1 259:5,18 262:17 265:13 268:2,23 269:14,25 270:19 271:4 273:1,6 274:11,13 281:21 282:24 285:9 291:8 294:24 295:2,5,8 303:22 304:1,23 305:24 307:13 knowing 73:23 217:19 knowledge 22:6 26:21 68:5 99:3 130:17 136:10	138:22 143:14 159:24 160:1 161:2 171:7,14 211:20 219:25 228:18 255:4 knowledgeable 209:10 known 59:24 197:18 218:3,10 219:16 220:17 283:8 kol 300:2,6 kols 300:9,12
l			
l 8:14 la 289:18 label 260:4,6,17 265:25 304:21 labeled 288:7 labeling 263:15 267:17 labels 301:21 305:25 laboratories 301:5 301:19 302:8 lack 46:4 154:24 197:21 213:13 landmark 60:4 language 154:13 167:23 223:3 292:16 large 25:21 26:16 27:4 42:2 73:25 74:9 77:8 80:2 84:2 97:18 102:3 102:18 103:12 106:16 111:25 115:11 122:24 129:23 140:16 155:9 163:16 165:15 193:6			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[large - limitations]

Page 33

229:7 243:9 largely 42:20 54:23 106:6 191:13 202:18 282:6 larger 107:8 116:25 lasalle 8:6 late 63:12,12,14 65:13 104:2 208:25 latest 61:4 laude 17:17 launching 280:2 lauren 9:14 15:21 15:21 law 2:13 52:14 160:16 286:8 laws 103:2 lawsuits 103:25 lawyer 51:18,18 lay 80:14 129:20 206:25 253:11,15 lays 120:17 lchb.com 3:11,12 3:13 lead 117:5 162:24 163:2,2,3 187:8 297:20 leader 69:7,8,15 leaders 68:25 69:23 110:22 leading 23:18 26:6 252:12 253:4 293:20 leads 111:13 119:7 174:25 297:17 298:1 learn 281:17 learned 66:4	learning 109:5 291:13 leaves 167:14 leaving 75:3 lecture 233:15,18 lectures 58:21 59:5 64:6 led 24:6 40:15,23 109:6 135:7 162:18 177:20 271:9 274:10 300:8 left 74:20 75:23 257:14 264:2 leftover 76:2 legal 51:15 91:10 92:2 95:25 96:4 97:15 113:14 legally 51:17 legitimate 39:7,10 71:23 72:2,4,9,13 72:23 73:1,6,8,9 73:13,18 74:2 75:17,19 76:13 77:11 83:12,13 94:18 96:15 117:4 124:6 137:19 161:23 162:15 163:9,18,24,25 231:18 245:7 leibell 9:5 10:14 15:1,1 301:2,3 302:23 303:4,24 305:13 309:23 lembke 1:14 2:12 10:7 11:2,7,11,14 13:7,13 16:14,25 22:16 46:9 55:18 67:6 78:5 84:21 90:25 97:4 123:16 126:22 127:10,14	237:8 251:4 268:18 270:15 271:8 272:23 273:25 275:10 278:13 279:20 280:18,23 281:16 283:17 285:16 286:6 290:15 301:2 309:23 310:6 314:20 315:2,21 lembke's 20:24 length 131:8 137:13 140:24 248:8 249:6 285:13 leo 3:16 15:8,11,12 15:13 leslie 1:24 2:17 13:22 316:4,25 lessened 252:24 lethal 34:22,24 37:8 lethality 37:2 letter 247:7,9 level 28:7 29:11,19 29:24 92:19 93:17 94:1 95:19,21 106:10 107:21 138:17 148:13 166:12 174:23 175:20 183:25 191:23 192:21,22 203:23 213:23 214:9 217:20 218:1 219:3,24 220:21,25 222:1 231:1 232:9,10 233:7,8,17,21 249:23 250:10 268:25 271:14,23	278:20 281:2,3 283:16 294:2 296:1 297:12,22 297:24 levels 71:2 94:17 189:24 292:25 293:13 294:11 leverage 177:13 lewis 9:4 15:1 liberal 33:5 76:21 108:25 110:1 liberally 111:19 license 53:10 99:10,14,24 100:14,16 135:16 231:6 licensed 55:8 60:19 61:12 142:10,21 143:1 196:10,22 licensees 105:1,4 licensing 99:13,23 licensure 61:7 99:19 100:4,5 142:18 lieff 2:14 3:4 13:19 15:4,25 lies 189:19 lieu 151:7 life 32:9 158:11 189:17 241:4 244:2 likelihood 236:2 likewise 167:21 233:4 253:24 263:23 264:6 limbic 148:25 limit 81:8 181:15 195:21,25 196:4 limitations 167:5
--	--	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[limited - majority]

Page 34

limited 40:2 79:23 83:5 169:6 173:14 234:18 236:3 line 10:20 22:4 32:11 82:6 83:4 105:10 138:12 171:11 186:25 219:1 229:15 241:21 243:23 244:21 269:21 315:8 lines 39:7 83:8 278:19 306:10 link 29:13 137:5 238:9 list 11:10 48:22 66:19,25 67:6,8,12 67:13,18 68:4 90:10 157:17,19 183:15 257:1 286:13,15,16,18 286:24 291:15 307:22 listed 67:17 68:3 125:20 183:16 275:17,19 276:13 287:24 288:7,22 289:10 291:24 308:4,6 315:7 listen 53:1 78:18 listing 197:18 lists 66:15 158:18 290:5 literature 63:22 77:16 119:11 140:23 litigation 1:6 2:6 13:15 18:1,13,16 18:23 19:2,8,17,19 20:2,6,9,12,14,25 21:8,13,16 41:5,10	41:15,16 42:1,4,17 42:22 43:7 55:19 56:4,7,11,16,21 57:9 66:16 68:14 68:19 125:21,24 139:15 145:21 159:22 166:22 301:6,13 302:3 308:21 309:5 little 56:18 114:19 181:8 193:6 211:14 271:16 306:13 311:22,23 313:25 live 77:21 232:19 lived 288:25 289:2 lives 146:15 living 77:25 246:7 llc 286:10 301:4,7 301:11 302:8 llp 2:14 3:4 4:13 5:4 6:4 7:6,15 8:4 8:13 loaded 189:12 lobbying 66:7 102:24 179:8 271:13 lobe 148:25 logical 223:16,20 lollipops 287:13 304:19 309:14 lollypop 287:15 long 17:11 18:17 43:20 56:20 77:5 80:21 94:17 103:4 103:12 109:17 140:3 145:5 153:5 153:6 182:3,7,8 183:1,10 186:21 188:19,22 189:7 190:6 196:2 200:9	206:1,12 225:11 226:11,20 231:22 253:8,8,13 263:16 264:7 265:25 268:23 269:1,6,18 277:25 283:19,19 285:10 298:6,7 longer 79:18,20 88:9,18 95:22 225:19 229:21 265:14 look 18:8 37:25 38:17,18 59:8 97:22 101:21,22 118:19 119:23 122:11 130:22 156:3 158:8 164:8 170:16 171:6 213:2 229:7 248:7 256:22 260:16 263:23 270:13 274:14 300:11 308:13 looked 142:4 213:2 254:15,21 270:3,3 307:14 looking 76:22 131:11 158:18 188:22 234:14 236:9 239:17 247:21 249:6 264:17 289:17,21 290:7 294:18 looks 61:18 180:21 los 4:16 lose 53:10 147:18 231:6 losing 110:5 losses 100:16 lost 73:22 96:19 147:23	lot 22:5 75:2 94:21 178:8 186:3 206:2 206:14 276:2 lots 45:14 231:9 285:6 293:7 low 94:17 105:17 306:12 lower 44:24 45:22 114:1 115:24,24 116:3 lpincus 9:18 lporter 6:19 luke 6:15 14:14 lunch 127:7
m			
m 5:6,16 6:5 m.d. 1:14 2:12 4:14 10:7 11:2,8 13:7,13 17:19 58:18 142:13 238:25 239:6 315:2,21 ma'am 254:20 286:17 magical 53:15,19 maintain 61:7 306:17 maintenance 180:25 241:16 major 33:6,9,10 34:12 69:11 117:21 129:4 137:15 181:3 198:24,25 224:15 228:9 majority 71:12 73:17,19 118:20 161:22 162:2,11 163:16,21 182:2 186:23 205:18,19 205:23 306:16			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[maker - means]

Page 35

maker 172:8,18	254:16,18 273:10	236:19 238:18	matter 16:8 34:7
makers 171:23,25	273:11 280:20,24	250:18,21,22,25	153:8,13 164:23
making 58:21	301:13 302:4	256:18 257:7	164:25
83:10 109:1	303:1,16	260:1 263:12	matthew 5:5 14:7
112:24 143:8	manufacturer	273:20 285:25	mccabe 117:8,11
150:9 197:24	25:1 281:18,23	286:1 288:10	118:19,20 122:23
256:6 271:5	282:5,22 283:1,4,9	298:9	mcconnell 5:17
280:12	manufacturer's	market 113:23	mckesson 8:12
mallinckrodt 7:14	113:17	144:2 185:2	14:25 36:18 68:8
14:21 175:15,16	manufacturers	247:16 252:13	68:10,10 69:17
192:17 214:16,19	24:6,13 35:17	254:16,19,21,23	101:10 104:17
214:21,24 215:8	68:15 69:25	255:1,5,7,8 295:8	256:14 258:15
215:15 218:1,10	102:24 109:4	marketed 302:15	310:8
218:16,19,24	113:15 172:2	marketing 127:24	mcneill 257:15
219:8,16,23 247:4	173:18 192:3	128:6 168:2,3,6,10	mdl 12:1 19:14
247:7,9,11 249:17	258:16 274:9,13	169:2,13,16,18,22	168:5 169:1
249:22 250:1,7,9	275:23 291:12	169:25 172:4,25	285:24 288:3
managed 178:20	292:10 293:18	173:3,9 174:6,14	291:15
management	296:2,24 297:6	175:7,15 195:4	mean 19:5,14 27:6
24:10 25:4 34:4	298:13 300:13	271:9,12 275:15	32:5,13 38:6 59:1
181:21,23,25	301:12 303:8	276:1,9 277:13	68:13,15,18 71:20
182:11,20 184:8	309:13	278:23 279:9	85:22 88:21
184:21 264:23	manufactures	292:19,24 294:10	112:22 142:16
265:2 266:17	215:11 273:2,3,7	295:14 302:19	144:25 146:16
267:19	301:8	martha 9:5 15:1	150:12 171:17,19
managing 253:21	manufacturing	301:3	174:22 198:22
mandated 66:2	252:23	martha.leibell 9:9	200:22 214:19
mandatory 61:7	march 305:9	massive 23:19	226:11 239:20
65:24	margin 37:10	24:6 34:13 123:12	262:12 263:7
manipulated	marginalized	material 168:10	283:23 293:10
69:23 70:2,6,10	157:9	275:16 276:9	310:13,16
manipulation	maria 8:5 14:22	287:5,9,13	meaning 68:17
68:24	286:8	materials 11:9	141:12,18 147:19
manner 252:16	marijuana 121:17	66:15,25 67:5,9,13	269:9
manual 149:4	marin 316:2	67:24 68:1,4,24	meaningful
manufacture	mark 119:24	109:3,5 159:16	188:20,25 265:12
251:7 301:22	126:19 154:2	175:7,15 276:2,3,6	284:19
302:12	273:17,17,19	277:13 287:22	means 32:18 33:12
manufactured	marked 13:6,8	290:13 291:13	116:21 137:19
113:7 252:6	18:6 67:6 120:1,5	292:7 302:7	171:21,22 210:6
253:13 254:11,14	126:1,13,23 154:6	308:25 309:3	228:6,7

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[meant - messages]

Page 36

meant 68:14,18 126:5 147:25 172:13 213:6 measure 108:21 108:23 109:2 110:12,16,18,25 138:6 249:8 297:19 measured 108:15 108:17 measures 108:1,2 108:3,10,13,24 110:1 181:15,16 282:2 284:19 mechanism 259:5 259:8 media 80:14 237:2 median 285:13 medicaid 107:24 medical 17:5,18 33:4 36:24 40:4 41:2 43:22,22 44:10,22 51:13 53:21,25 54:6,14 60:18,21,24 61:1,2 61:6,8 63:13,15,20 63:21 64:6 66:10 66:14 68:25 69:1 69:2,9,11 70:2,6 70:10 71:23 72:2 72:13,23 73:2,6,8 73:13,15,18 80:2 83:13 87:4 89:18 91:16 93:14,15,19 95:2 99:2,4,5 100:16,23,25 101:1,2,4,5,7,12 101:14,24 102:1 103:1,10,18,25 104:23,25 105:6,7 105:9,23,25	106:10,18,19,22 107:2,6,10 116:1 116:16,24 117:9 117:11,19 118:16 118:22 119:3 141:13,19 142:3 142:11,18,21 143:1 150:20 151:23 152:24 157:16 158:8 159:14 161:24 162:15 163:9,18 196:17 197:5,10 197:11,14,18,22 197:25 198:3,8,10 198:12 199:3 202:5,18 204:1,3,8 205:6,24 208:14 209:1 213:2 227:25 228:25 231:6 253:17 268:19 275:16,21 275:24 282:8 287:5,14 312:8 medically 206:8 207:14,25 208:5,7 208:10,23 278:16 296:20 302:25 303:15 309:20 medicare 107:24 114:25 115:2,5,6 116:6 180:22,23 181:1,5 294:5 medication 38:13 38:14 39:4 50:4,7 59:21 60:18 74:4 80:9 81:23 85:2,5 85:14,14,24 88:24 95:18,22 143:12 181:6 198:15 201:20 202:1,2,9	204:11 208:17 225:23 230:4,12 231:18 237:23 244:3 262:4,10,14 262:21 273:1 279:8 304:20 305:14,15,20,24 306:2 307:4 medications 30:19 30:21 37:1,8 38:6 52:7 53:9 73:5 89:19 93:24,25 99:15,16 118:24 135:24 185:1,8,12 207:8 225:5 254:2 256:7 273:2,6 278:15 305:4 306:5 307:6 medicine 17:2,6,7 17:8,24 40:6,7,14 47:22 55:2,8 58:7 58:15 59:12,24 60:5 64:14 72:8 74:6,20 75:23 77:19 81:3,5,11 82:8 96:18 99:10 99:22 100:9,13,19 103:21 104:5 106:17 110:15 117:18 172:14 177:13 179:23 196:11 201:19 204:25 209:15 210:24 211:3 213:9 231:9 290:21 303:22 304:4,12 305:21 medicines 171:16 171:21,24 205:17 247:12 301:7,22 302:12,14 303:20	307:11 meet 36:5 108:1,2 110:24 188:20 245:23 meeting 108:10,13 152:22 195:11,15 195:15 megan 8:14 14:24 310:7 melville 4:7 member 101:4,11 106:18 137:8 231:17 members 36:9 75:23 93:12 96:25 97:12 101:7 189:16 190:10,10 190:21 192:6 217:2 memories 287:12 memory 199:23 mental 149:8 224:15 227:25 232:25 235:18 mention 129:11 275:1 299:4 314:4 mentioned 104:8 128:20 138:23 141:11 166:15 229:24 251:22 255:11 256:13 272:14 284:24 288:2 303:17 mere 227:4 merely 30:20 message 76:8 105:17 181:3 messages 62:15 63:5 66:9 69:3 105:14 173:18 174:19 181:3
---	--	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[messages - mooney]

Page 37

195:3,4,4 209:5 278:23 289:3 306:10 307:23,24 308:19 messaging 63:19 69:13 280:8 309:13 met 127:16 251:5 metaanalysis 188:22 methadone 180:24 methicillan 243:12 methodology 177:4,25 178:13 180:13 miami 9:7 microphone 99:9 microphones 14:1 mid 43:22 63:12 middle 266:11 midst 80:6 midway 257:14 mild 150:3 mill 39:16 40:18 40:22 139:22 207:5 milligram 130:23 131:2,3,4 248:3 261:11,19 263:24 297:18 milligrams 261:4 297:21,22 million 115:2 116:6 157:6,8 millions 115:15,17 124:10 152:15 153:9,14,19,23 195:10 mills 26:22,23,25 139:20	mind 44:16 51:19 240:17 242:17,22 264:17,21 286:11 mine 186:11 221:25 mineola 3:18 minimal 90:3 minor 32:11,23 106:16 164:3 minority 162:2,11 163:1 242:9,10 minute 90:16 mischa 11:18 236:19 misconceptions 62:16 miseducated 74:3 230:9 misinformation 65:18 109:6 142:7 misinformed 73:7 74:3 misleading 63:4 66:9 69:3 70:14 105:14,17 127:20 173:17 174:19 182:12,14 194:25 195:5,8 209:5 222:23,24 224:1,2 266:22 277:21,24 278:4,23 295:25 306:9 307:23 308:18 309:13 311:1,18 312:10 312:16,23 misled 32:19 272:8,10 misrepresentation 109:15 140:13 271:25 272:5 280:5 292:11	misrepresentatio... 63:3 272:11 278:10 misrepresenting 222:18 238:7 misrepresents 292:8 missed 96:15 missing 66:22 260:17 missive 80:10 misstates 178:5 mistaken 276:12 misunderstood 312:4 misuse 93:25 182:18 183:3 184:7,20 193:14 193:21 198:7 210:10,12 214:2,5 216:19 223:10,15 224:22 225:7 226:7 227:18,19 282:1 284:22 misused 281:9,22 296:14 misusers 117:23 misusing 65:9 75:12 83:9 282:21 mitigating 306:23 mitigation 305:2 mmooney 5:10 mode 233:12 model 101:15 102:9,12,14,17 104:6 107:2 moderate 150:3 260:18 264:23 266:17 267:19 modifications 95:17	modified 224:20 mom 241:4 moment 18:8 180:24 234:15 308:14 moments 104:8 monday 145:6,8 145:11 money 36:3 37:9 37:24 monitor 191:15 203:16 213:11 306:15 monitored 90:9 274:12 monitoring 25:18 82:19 92:24 93:18 99:13 132:9 170:25 171:4,10 191:6,12,19,22,24 192:18 203:23 210:1 224:22 225:6 226:7 232:10 274:2,5,17 274:21 monologue 78:25 month 16:17 154:14 155:16 156:15,25 244:18 307:14 months 224:9 241:2,9 243:11 244:10,16 283:25 285:9 mood 17:21 mooney 5:5 10:8 14:7,7 16:14 19:15,20 20:23 21:6,11 22:14 24:20 27:8 29:20 31:2,10 32:25
---	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[mooney - neurobiologically]

Page 38

34:3,24 35:13 37:15,18,23 41:13 42:14,21 46:8,17 47:5 48:11 49:9 49:18 50:5 51:6 51:22 52:3 53:1 53:14,25 54:7,15 55:10,18,24 56:15 57:19,23 58:2 67:3,8,24 71:6,14 71:22 73:3 74:23 75:9 79:12,23 81:2,12,22 82:12 83:24 84:20 85:19 86:20 88:15,22 89:6 90:16,25 92:14 95:3,24 96:7 97:2,9 98:6 98:20 99:22 100:8 101:21 102:6 109:23 114:1,16 116:5,19 119:24 120:4 123:15,23 124:13 126:19,24 127:2,10 moral 73:22 morgan 9:4 15:1 morganlewis.com 9:9 morning 13:9 16:14,15 67:12 129:15 241:13 morphine 29:10 29:23 60:10 130:23 131:2,3,4 244:17,25 246:25 248:2 297:18,21 mortality 84:13 motivate 216:25 motivation 148:17 148:22	mouthful 228:5 move 30:24 46:8 71:6 79:25 84:20 89:6 97:2 109:23 123:15 133:18 169:8 236:12 259:3 292:13 314:8 moved 190:2 241:9 mriviera 8:9 mrodgers 8:19 mrsa 243:12 muhuri 117:22 119:16 120:7 multi 20:9 38:2 multidistrict 41:5 multiple 71:2 83:17 99:18 159:2 187:4 287:4 mute 226:15 myers 4:13 14:10 myriad 214:11 n n 10:1 naive 285:5 naloxone 181:2 name 13:21 16:24 51:13 127:16 129:12 134:3,12 251:5 260:17 270:10,16 272:23 281:2,11 286:8 295:11 296:12,17 296:21 301:3 303:3,6,18 309:11 309:22 310:7 316:20 named 70:16 naming 296:1	napoli 4:4 15:19 napolilaw.com 4:9 narcotics 28:7 nasem 28:1,4,15 70:24 86:24 nassau 4:3 15:19 55:5 84:1,8,23 85:20 86:13 130:3 130:5,8,14,21,25 131:12,20 132:14 133:22 134:6,25 135:6 136:4,8,11 136:13 137:6,6,24 138:5,16,20 139:5 139:19,21 140:2 140:17 141:3 143:12,14,18 144:2,8 157:17 158:3 159:7,13,18 160:3,9,12,17,21 161:1,4,9,15,22 162:7,13 163:8,17 164:21 165:9 175:16 207:19 248:17 279:3,17 280:21,25 281:10 281:14 293:9,14 296:10,19 302:24 309:7,19 nation 116:3 national 112:11 118:2 169:1 173:12 174:23 271:14 294:5 nationally 246:11 natively 314:2 natural 111:23,23 122:9 nature 95:16 170:10 182:23 183:8	nearly 199:21 245:11 necessarily 150:24 153:15 195:11 210:6 218:11 258:22 264:9 269:4 271:6 necessary 53:23 96:4 288:21 289:4 289:8 312:7 necessitating 216:18 need 26:3 38:10,12 82:14 83:22 89:4 91:16 97:24 108:16 122:10 129:24 165:17 182:22 191:15 193:7 196:2 204:1 204:2 214:9,15,25 225:14 needed 49:22 79:9 217:9 220:21 264:25 266:19 267:21 needles 241:10,11 needs 148:17 202:6 204:21,22 221:1 nefarious 258:21 negative 77:9 96:17 216:12,13 311:12 neighborhood 77:22 neighbors 74:21 neither 284:15 316:16 neurobiologically 313:11,13
--	---	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[never - numbered]

Page 39

never 26:2 51:9 53:20 92:9 97:16 98:6 147:3 148:8 193:7 208:13 216:23 217:7 231:16,16,16 253:1 280:10 new 1:1 2:1 3:15 3:18 4:7 7:9,9 9:16,16 13:17 15:9,14 19:14,15 20:2,6 26:24 27:1 41:8,15,20,24 42:8 42:16,17 52:25 54:25 55:5,8 56:11,16,21 57:9 58:7,15 59:23 60:5 64:14 77:4 84:12 86:22 94:6 94:9,25 99:4,5,9 99:10,14,23 100:3 100:8 101:4 103:21 104:5 106:18,21 130:24 131:1,7,21,21 132:7,10 139:9,12 143:23 144:16 145:14 159:22,25 161:7,16,18,18 172:9,11,12,19,22 173:4,8,14,17,18 173:21,25 174:5 174:11,14,16,18 174:22,22 175:1,6 175:7,13,24 176:3 176:22 177:7 178:3,22 179:2,19 180:17 186:7 190:15 196:11,13 196:13,16,20 197:2,6 205:11,16	205:25 206:7,17 206:22 207:2,5,9 207:12,12,15,24 235:12 241:5,9 246:3,3,8,11 247:17 248:2,5,8 248:20 249:5,17 250:7 254:16,22 254:24 255:2,9 270:1,2 271:10,15 271:18 272:6,10 278:15,21,22 279:8,23 280:21 280:25 281:9,14 288:9 291:15 292:19 293:1,2,8 294:2,6,11,14,23 294:25 295:6,9,12 295:18,21,23 296:4,9,14,16,19 303:14 309:12,15 309:18 newspaper 27:17 27:18 80:24 207:5 nice 119:23 night 66:24 67:12 67:19 275:13 nine 22:19 31:20 239:19,21,23 nmp 120:23,24 121:4 nodding 241:19 nods 79:3 86:1 87:1 199:8 220:12 262:2 non 38:13 72:13 87:4 107:19 129:21 185:8,13 187:18,22 188:15 194:9,9 195:7 235:20 254:2	283:20 284:4 nonexistent 148:22 nonmedical 116:12,16,19,21 116:24 117:5,10 117:11,16 118:5,7 118:9,15,17,21,25 119:3,5,18 120:8 120:18,20 121:1 121:11,13,14 193:14,22 245:6 253:16 nonresponsive 259:4 nonsense 237:24 norepinephrine 259:9 normative 85:9 86:5 106:17 north 8:6 northern 293:13 norway 155:23 156:7 notary 315:25 notations 11:15 126:17,23 note 13:24 89:3 167:3 217:18 229:9 noted 129:8 138:10 314:23 notes 11:14,19 126:17,22 180:22 238:18,22 239:4 239:18,20 240:8 242:18 noticed 273:13 noting 70:24 november 19:18 260:9	nuanced 45:16 147:17 nuances 100:2 nucynta 36:19 68:9 251:8 255:2 256:15 257:10,20 257:23 258:2,7,19 259:10,18,19,22 260:5,23,25 261:11,15,18 262:1,4 263:16,17 264:8,16,22 265:2 265:7,10,15,22 266:1,12,16 267:4 267:10,19 268:12 268:14 271:10,18 nucynta's 259:8 number 11:4 13:17 24:7 27:9 28:20 40:12 54:8 54:15 57:3 61:6 61:18 76:5 81:10 82:5 86:21 97:18 113:7 114:11 115:12,18,20,23 116:4 123:21,24 124:3,12,13,15,18 131:24 134:4 137:18,22 138:1 155:9 156:24 158:2 163:7,11 164:19 165:7,12 166:2 178:18,24 199:12 200:22,23 201:6 206:3 212:3 212:6,8 237:21 249:4,9 257:2 273:19 288:8 295:2 numbered 239:8
---	---	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[numbers - office]

Page 40

numbers 20:25 37:13,22 80:13 81:18 84:2 117:15 156:6,13 157:2 158:2 293:5 numeric 27:14 137:22 numerically 113:2 numerous 35:9 nurse 204:15 250:8 nurses 173:4 175:6,13 nw 5:7 nycynta's 259:5 nycyntas 264:12	82:17 85:16 86:18 88:11,20 89:1 92:12 94:7 95:5 96:1 97:8,25 98:16 99:17 100:1 113:24 114:13 115:21 116:15 117:2 119:20 123:19 124:2 133:24 135:9 143:2 145:9 146:7 147:1 148:4,6,19 150:11 151:16 153:12 161:25 162:16 163:10,14 164:7 165:10 168:13,19 172:15 173:11,15 174:8,8 174:9 175:9,18 176:11 177:8 178:5,17,23 179:3 179:20 180:7,18 182:13,21 183:14 184:11,23 186:18 187:23 188:16 189:11 191:1,21 192:20 194:3,15 195:2,23 199:18 201:8,21 202:4,12 202:25 203:17 204:13 205:8 206:5,10,23 212:11 214:18 215:1,6,16 216:10 217:17,17 218:6,9 218:22 219:19 220:11,24 221:5 223:12 225:8 226:9,12 228:15 230:15 231:25 234:6 235:13	238:6 246:6 247:18 250:3 251:16 252:19 254:4 255:17,21 259:12,20 262:6 262:16,24 265:4 268:4 269:2 270:18,19 271:22 272:3 276:5 278:7 278:17 279:10 280:13 288:24 289:11 295:15 296:11 297:2,14 297:25 299:16 302:17 303:2,21 305:10 310:12,17 310:24 311:9,21 312:13 313:9 objection 19:12 20:17 22:8 126:21 154:21 167:6 186:9 200:25 206:23 219:10 220:18 221:21 224:24 objections 19:13 316:9 objective 110:12 159:4 284:20 obligation 52:15 obligations 113:14 observed 143:6 190:21 observing 26:6 83:7 obsessive 228:10 obstacle 256:11 obtain 49:16 76:9 85:2 95:21 obtained 109:3	obtaining 72:12 153:25 obvious 150:24 151:4 189:1 211:19 213:19 obviously 193:1 246:7 occasion 97:16 255:25 occur 34:15 71:2 72:6,19,20 90:12 193:13,20 194:21 occurred 22:24 23:6,12 34:16 44:9 63:10,15 79:11,19 141:3 176:15 177:18,19 occurring 38:23 93:15 211:16 217:9 229:24 occurs 79:18 269:4 odds 122:19 234:12 235:17 offer 16:23 18:15 18:23 19:1,7,7 41:9,25 42:8,16 51:17,17 67:17 89:8 114:3 125:21 125:23 142:14 169:7 171:5 274:8 276:15,22 offered 41:16 offering 86:20 87:12 159:18 168:12 274:1,4,7 274:16,20 275:4,7 294:9,13 office 3:15 15:8,13 75:12 111:4 232:19 304:19
o			
o'melveny 4:13 14:10 o'toole 3:16 15:8,8 15:11,13,13 oakland 170:12,19 270:6 oath 42:24 316:8 object 20:21 21:2 21:9,20 24:11 27:5 29:17 31:7 32:17 33:25 34:10 35:11 37:12,20 39:12 41:11 42:10 42:18 45:13 46:12 46:21 47:8 48:9 49:6,11,25 51:2,14 51:24 52:23 53:11 53:17 54:4,10 55:21 56:12 57:16 57:22,25 59:7 67:20 70:22 71:11 71:18 72:25 73:16 74:7 75:7 79:4 80:4 81:6,16 82:3			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[offices - opioid]

Page 41

offices 2:13	207:11,21 208:4	omm.com 4:18	182:9,12,15,17
offset 262:9	210:4 211:6 212:3	once 61:3 122:13	187:2,20 188:13
oh 15:21 28:23	212:19 214:14	209:8	189:9 190:24
132:5 170:8	215:20 217:4,11	one's 79:16	192:15,17 193:11
217:22 240:1	220:13,15,22	ones 82:1,16 289:9	193:19 194:13
260:12 273:20	221:3 223:6,9,24	ongoing 37:3	196:7,25 197:4
287:18 298:11	224:8,12,18 225:3	109:20 152:19	201:18 202:21
304:1 312:4	227:3,7,10,22	203:16 224:4	205:15 206:6,8,18
ohio 5:18	228:12 229:1	ooo 13:4 314:24	207:11,22,25
okay 15:11 27:19	233:11 234:10,16	op 69:20 101:11	208:2 219:15,18
36:15 67:3 78:13	234:17,21 236:12	104:18	219:20,23 222:6
84:11 102:6	237:6,15,17,20	opana 273:3	222:20 224:18
105:22 120:17	238:5,15,15,17	openly 211:18	231:20 232:14,16
127:18 128:19	239:2,8 240:5,13	opine 81:17 92:3	233:20 242:1
129:1 130:2,13	241:20,25 242:24	113:12,20 162:1	247:6 249:14,19
133:1,11 134:15	243:7,8 246:1	163:15 165:6	249:21,24 250:5
136:21 138:10	247:2,11 248:12	168:6 181:4	252:21 257:19
139:4 143:5	249:1,13,19,24	183:11	264:14 268:15
145:16,19 146:3	250:5,11 260:22	opining 195:7	274:8 275:18
152:13 153:18	261:6 264:17	247:10 267:16	276:11 278:3
154:2 155:2 156:9	266:2 270:12	274:25	283:18 287:7
156:13,20,22	273:24 275:3	opinion 21:8 23:11	294:8,9,13
157:12,15,25	279:17 281:4,8	23:15 28:24 31:19	opinions 18:15,19
158:18 159:15	286:23 287:1,8,20	33:4,8 41:10,14,25	18:22 19:1,3,4,6
160:8 161:11,14	288:6,17 289:7,14	67:14,21 68:21,25	20:15 22:20 31:20
161:17,20 165:13	289:21 290:7,15	69:7,8,14,23 81:2	42:4,7,15,20 66:16
166:7,24 170:10	291:14,20,23	86:20 87:12 89:8	67:17 68:2 125:19
170:18,21 173:7	292:4,13,22 293:6	91:11 103:16	125:22,23 159:18
175:21 176:6,16	293:24 294:15	106:3 110:22	160:10,14,18,22
177:4 178:19	297:10,20 298:8	114:3 115:17	166:25 168:12,14
179:14 180:1	298:16 299:1,13	129:1,3,7,17 133:5	168:16 169:8
181:7 182:5,16	299:22 300:1,6,18	133:11 134:10,20	254:17 274:1,4,7
184:18,25 185:4	301:16 304:2	136:21 137:1,11	274:16,20 275:4,7
185:11,15 186:25	307:20 308:11	138:19 142:14	275:11 276:15,23
190:18 194:24	309:7	158:1,6 160:25	277:3,7,12,16
195:19 196:6,10	old 3:17 83:6	163:6 164:12,14	286:20 287:3,10
196:21,25 197:4,9	138:24 139:5,7	166:2 168:11	287:23 292:2
197:14 199:4	244:4	171:5,8 175:23	opioid 1:6 2:6
200:5 201:4 203:9	older 154:16	176:2,16,21	11:16 13:14 20:11
203:13,21 205:2	156:17 260:19	178:10 179:18	20:14 21:12,15
205:10,19 207:7		181:10,11,19	22:23 23:6,11

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[opioid - opioids]

Page 42

24:6,13,15 25:20	123:8,10,17 124:5	211:11 214:11,20	282:11,13,17,20
25:22 26:15,16	124:7,22 128:21	216:14 222:7,10	282:22,25 283:2,9
27:4 28:6,24 29:2	131:2,6,8,11,13,14	222:11,14,22	283:19 284:3
29:3,9,10,11,13,14	131:17,20,25	223:2,10,11,15,23	285:5,11,12,14
29:15,16,18,21,22	133:13,14,16	224:12,20 225:2,5	289:18 290:5,22
29:23 30:2,6 31:5	134:2 135:3,4	225:10,11,14,17	291:5,12 292:8,10
31:11,22 33:5,7,8	137:5,8 138:11	225:18,21,23,25	292:18,18,24
34:13 35:13,15,24	139:17 140:18	226:5,12,19,20	293:18,21 294:2
36:5 38:10,11,14	144:9 149:15,24	227:4,7,18,19,20	294:10 295:6,9,13
39:4,4,18 41:5	150:7,16 151:6	227:23 228:14,17	295:17,25 296:1,5
42:3 43:24,24	152:8,14,16,20,23	228:20,22 229:4,8	296:10,14,15,15
44:3,9,19,25,25	152:25 153:11,15	229:10,13,17,19	296:20 297:1,1,7,8
45:5,12,15,21 46:6	154:5,14 155:9,16	229:22,25 230:4	297:11,11,12,18
46:10,14,19 47:2	155:22 156:15	230:12,21 231:3,7	297:23,24 298:2,6
47:12 48:15,17,18	157:7,8 158:4,10	231:18 232:8,22	298:6 301:12
49:17 54:2,18,19	158:24 159:11	233:2,6 234:9,12	302:12,14,25
55:19 56:3,6 58:8	161:4,6 162:6	234:24 235:9,11	303:8,16 304:7
58:20 59:25 64:18	163:21 165:3	235:17,20,22,23	306:17 307:2
64:22 66:6 68:12	170:14 171:12,13	236:2,3 242:2,3,12	308:9 309:13
68:15,22,23 69:22	172:2 173:3,18	242:15 245:2,18	311:4 313:2,7,17
69:25 70:1,5,9	174:23 175:24	245:24 246:4,10	313:20
72:3 73:17 74:4	176:3,15,21,25	246:15,20 247:11	opioids 23:1,8,14
74:17,25 76:1,25	177:1,6,11,14,16	247:16 248:2,5,8	23:19 24:19 27:13
77:5 78:3 80:3,12	177:17 178:3,21	248:16 249:7,16	28:3 30:7,9,20
81:7 83:23,25	179:2,19,24 180:4	249:22,25 250:7	31:1,15 32:1,7,10
84:13 85:7 86:3	180:6,17,20,21,25	251:23 252:18	32:15,21,23 33:1
88:8,13,16 91:12	181:2,15 182:6,18	253:9,11,20,21	33:12 34:25 35:4
93:4,6,23,24 95:12	183:3,5,10,22	254:2,16,18	35:8,20,22,24
95:13 98:22,22,24	184:2,6,19 185:1,7	255:11 258:8,15	36:12,17,25 37:6
102:4,24 104:13	185:11,21 186:2	258:16,17 260:18	37:10 38:4,8,14,20
104:22 105:12	187:3,14 189:6,10	263:1,3 264:22,24	38:24 39:20 40:2
106:4,15,23	189:13 190:6,8,15	265:22 266:19	40:8,16,24 43:15
107:11 109:3,7,9	190:21 191:4	267:21 268:3,11	43:17,20,21,24
111:13 112:3,17	192:3,14 194:5,5	268:23 269:1,17	44:1,3,8,12,19
114:17,22,22	197:2,7,19 198:4,7	269:18 272:11	45:1,9,15 46:4,5
115:1,3,11,12	199:21 200:15,24	273:1,6 274:10,13	46:24 47:1,1,1,2,7
116:1,12,20,21,21	201:3,7 203:6	275:23 277:12	47:10,24 48:5,8
116:25 117:4,6	205:16,22 206:21	278:15 279:24	49:3,19,23 51:12
118:12,23 119:13	207:2,8 208:24	280:20,24 281:5,9	51:22 52:1,3
121:23 122:8,8,11	209:3,8,17,17,20	281:13,17,19,22	53:15,19,21,22
122:14,22 123:1,5	210:10,23 211:2,8	281:23,25 282:7	54:1,16 58:4,12,22

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[opioids - overprescribing]

Page 43

58:24 59:11,20,24 60:3,7 62:15,18 63:8 64:3,8 65:4 65:10 69:4 70:15 71:14,23 72:23 73:13,23,24 74:2,9 74:12,19,22 75:13 75:13,14,17,22,23 76:6,11,17,22 77:9 77:13 78:1 80:8 80:19,20,25 81:9 81:10,13 82:22,22 83:3,9 84:8,16,23 85:11,12 86:7,13 87:15 88:23 89:10 90:1,8,13 91:15 92:22 94:11,20 98:15,25 100:17 101:16 102:3,18 103:3,5,12 104:1 104:10 105:9,15 106:1,8,11 108:25 109:8,10,15,17 110:2 111:16,19 112:4,21 113:1,7 113:11,22 114:6 114:11 117:10,20 117:23 118:5,10 118:21 119:1 123:4,9,11,25 124:11,25 127:21 127:24 128:23 129:4,16,23,24 130:16 131:10,17 136:4,12 137:14 137:14,15 139:9 140:3,14,16 152:9 152:16 153:5,6,9 153:19,24 159:8 161:22 162:3,13 162:18,20 163:7	163:17 164:1,19 165:8,19 166:3,25 168:4 171:23,25 172:3,5,6,8,19,21 172:23 175:3 180:10,16 181:23 182:2,3,19,25 183:17 184:8,21 185:4,17,19,23,24 186:7,17,21 187:5 187:11,17,21 188:14,19,22 189:25 190:14 191:15 192:25 193:12,20 194:7 196:1,17 199:16 199:24 200:7,9,12 201:2,11 202:21 203:1,2,5,10,22 205:11,25 206:12 207:24 208:5 209:12 213:4 215:11 216:4 220:1 222:2 223:18 229:19 230:25 235:21 237:3 242:14 243:18 244:16 245:6,6,7,23 246:9 246:17,24 248:10 252:6,10,12,22 253:2,3,7,10,14,17 253:25 254:1,9,11 254:14 258:10,13 263:5,7 268:13,16 268:22,24,25 269:6,7,22 282:10 282:14 284:11,13 285:2,7 290:4 292:25 293:20 294:5,19 295:18	298:4 301:25 304:6 305:7 306:7 306:10,16,17,21 312:8,18 opposed 35:8,20 opposite 218:24 order 11:5 13:5 16:18,20,21 28:8 28:16 33:15,17 61:4,7 64:17 78:11,14,17 79:8 92:24 93:5 107:23 110:24 168:20,25 169:3 170:24 171:4,10 201:5 213:25 221:8 228:10 229:12 231:11 250:1 262:18 268:10 274:2,5,17,21 293:25 297:7 305:5 306:5 ordered 39:22 ordering 38:20 orders 25:18 34:2 34:18,21 39:4,14 39:14,19 89:3 91:14 171:6 274:12 organ 198:24,25 organization 99:13 101:2 107:20 organizations 99:19 107:14 291:4 308:23 origins 64:16,16 ortho 257:15 outcome 316:19 outcomes 111:11 111:14	outpatient 305:16 305:22 outside 114:14,15 163:19 176:24 179:23 217:10 outweigh 165:1 186:24 230:2 outweighed 206:13 outweighing 204:4 outweighs 186:8 225:20 overall 199:2 249:9 251:23 295:17 297:12,23 303:8 overcome 146:6 146:24 297:17 overdispensed 253:4 overdistributed 253:4 overdose 26:9 29:3 38:12 92:1 129:5 137:6 140:6 140:20 157:16,21 159:10 186:1 197:2,7 245:9 249:20 253:22 overdosed 280:24 296:4,9 overlap 194:20 overnight 65:12 overprescribed 58:4,12,25 64:8 253:3 overprescribing 22:25 23:8,13 40:11 58:22 59:15 59:20 60:3,7 64:18 112:18
--	---	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[overprescribing - part]

Page 44

207:3 252:10 293:20 295:18 306:25 311:4 312:18 313:2,20 overseeing 101:14 overstatement 62:17 oversupply 23:19 24:19 40:23 58:22 59:10,16 60:7 117:20 129:4 133:15 140:11 162:21 222:2 253:22 258:18 274:10 292:12 293:20 overuse 198:7 overwhelming 93:23 owe 195:13 oxycodone 28:12 70:19,25 71:7 200:3 265:11,22 273:4 301:15 oxymorphone 273:4	page 10:20 11:17 22:14,23 28:1 29:7,20 31:10 60:8 62:13 68:21 70:23 84:11 86:25 90:11 101:22 114:4 118:3,19 120:2,10,13 123:5 124:20 130:23 154:3,5,13 157:21 157:22 180:20 207:17 233:23,24 234:20 235:15 236:7 237:6,7,21 240:13,18 242:24 242:25 243:9,9 247:22 257:21 264:18 265:24 266:3 267:24 286:14 298:20,21 315:8 pages 22:19 239:19,22,23 242:16,25 243:2,6 300:11 316:13 pagination 239:21 paid 19:20 20:1,5 20:15,21 21:1,7,15 21:18 55:19 56:10 69:12 145:14 pain 17:10 23:22 23:24 31:15,22 32:6,8,11,23 34:13 40:14 41:2 43:13 43:18,25 44:1,9,13 44:15,23 45:2,6,10 45:21 46:5,6 47:1 47:2,20,21,24 50:25 53:16 60:10 60:19 61:12 65:23 66:3,8 74:18	75:17 76:12 77:6 80:18 83:4,5 85:9 86:6 94:18 99:15 102:19,21,23 103:6,13,19,22 104:1 105:10,16 106:1,16 108:19 108:20,25 109:2,8 109:11,12,13,14 109:21 110:2,16 110:17,18,18,21 110:22 111:1,3,6 111:10,11,12,14 111:15,16 112:4 112:13 114:6 119:15 120:8,18 120:20 121:1,11 121:12,14 122:8 124:6 152:9 153:10,20,24 164:3 165:18 175:3 181:21,23 181:24 182:1,4,7,8 182:11,20,24 184:8,21 185:5,8,9 185:13,17,19,23 187:6,22 188:15 188:23 189:18,22 189:24,25 190:1,3 190:6,17,22 191:4 192:9 201:19,19 202:1,1,16 204:11 205:5 209:9,13,15 225:15 231:1,8,18 244:3,5 259:11,14 259:19,22 260:19 260:23 261:1 262:5 263:3,6 264:23 265:3,16 266:18,25 267:1 267:20 268:16	269:20 275:23,25 283:20 284:4,20 298:14,21 299:3,8 299:14 304:7 306:11 310:10,22 311:7,15,19 312:2 312:11,20,23 painkillers 123:12 palo 8:16,17 61:16 paper 60:4 294:4 307:13,18 par 7:4,4 14:18,18 272:24 273:6,9,10 273:11 277:9 280:20,25 281:5,9 281:13 par's 274:21 275:8 paradigm 22:24 23:7,12,16,21,21 23:23 24:2,4 31:14 32:10 40:4 40:14 59:22 66:8 68:23 123:13 290:21 paragraph 22:23 23:5,16 29:15,20 31:11 62:13 78:17 124:20 155:14 156:24 243:10 298:21,24 parse 222:13 part 31:13 39:15 40:21 44:21 52:13 73:25,25 75:4,5,8 75:17 89:25 101:14 102:16 114:23,25 115:2,5 115:6 116:6 134:1 139:16 147:15 156:14 165:15 173:20 180:13,22
p			
p 5:5 p.m. 2:16 127:9 167:12,16 215:22 215:25 226:24 227:2 236:18,23 239:12,15 241:14 250:16 251:2 272:19,21 285:22 286:4 300:22,25 310:1,4 314:21,23 package 301:21,24 302:3 pad 76:21			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[part - pending]

Page 45

180:23 181:1 213:4 216:19 228:25 243:20 244:16 245:12 252:8 273:14,16 273:21,23 275:17 287:6 305:5 308:14 partial 79:16 partially 63:4 particular 50:4,6 50:19 83:18 146:22 158:2 196:14 205:4 213:17 218:7 230:5,18,19 240:17,18 246:19 249:5,25 259:18 260:9 269:21 279:7 280:8 particularly 32:9 parties 13:25 211:9 party 88:5 181:5 241:13 316:17,17 pass 103:2 247:4 250:12 272:16 285:17,18 300:18 passage 242:23 passive 30:20 patch 251:8 path 24:12 pathway 119:4,4 190:16 203:7 patient 30:6,10,13 45:12,19,23 46:11 49:5,12,21,22,23 50:19,25 51:9,13 51:20 54:14 64:24 70:21 71:10,15 73:11,24 74:11	82:20 83:15,18,19 84:25 86:11 93:6 93:8,9,15 94:18 95:13,16 96:14,24 97:1,11,21 98:4,14 98:19,20,22,24 109:11 111:4,18 112:2,19,24 113:4 117:5 128:22 132:23 134:3,25 137:25 143:13 146:23 147:3,9,13 148:9,14,17 150:10,21 151:5 151:11,21 153:3 159:3 170:15 180:15 181:12 182:20 183:9,24 184:9,22 197:10 198:24 200:19 201:15 202:10 204:12,19 205:7 208:12,18 209:24 212:24 213:17,18 214:1,17 215:4 216:14 217:1 218:18 219:6 220:5 221:12 223:9,19 230:5,12 230:19 231:1,2,5 232:3,6,14 257:20 257:22 258:1,20 261:14 262:5,9,13 262:21 263:2 266:13 267:23 268:2 269:16 279:24 281:16,21 282:24 283:5,7 307:8,9 patient's 48:17 49:8,10 74:6	93:10 110:13 151:7 189:20 197:11,14 203:14 225:19 230:23 231:8 patients 24:14 30:18,22 32:15 35:5 36:12 43:13 43:15,17 44:18,24 46:2,19,23 47:7 48:4,8 49:2,18 51:4,11 52:5,12,15 52:22 58:18 61:5 63:23 64:11 65:8 72:1 73:4,5,21 74:18 75:2,11,20 76:5,12 77:6,8 80:18,23 81:25 88:22 89:25 92:23 93:22 95:7,8 98:7 98:12 104:1 107:21 109:16,17 109:21 111:12,25 112:1,5,9,11,16 114:6 119:12 122:7,10,18 124:5 129:16 130:15 132:20 133:7,9,22 135:23 136:3,11 136:18 137:3,9 147:18 148:3 165:18 174:16 180:22 189:14 190:5 191:16 192:4,5,6,7,9 194:8 196:18 198:1,11 199:6,13 199:22 200:16,22 200:24 201:6,7,12 205:17 206:8,14 208:6,24 209:11	209:12,15 210:10 210:14,16 211:8 211:18,21 212:15 213:22 214:4,24 215:13 216:3 222:6,9,21 223:3 223:14,22 224:8 224:13,19,21 225:4,6,13,24 226:4,6 228:18,19 229:10,16,18,21 229:23 230:7 232:9,20,23 233:4 243:24 256:6,11 260:19 269:5 282:12 283:12 284:7,8,16 285:7 285:12 304:7,9,16 304:18 305:15,21 306:15 307:3 pattern 50:18 98:3 139:24 151:12 263:1 290:13 294:20 patterns 269:24 270:1 271:14 pay 20:12 256:11 258:2,21 paying 231:17 232:24 256:10 303:11 payments 21:12 21:22 69:14 256:7 300:2 payor 181:5 pdf 18:21 peer 119:11 140:23 293:16 pellegrino 8:5 pending 22:4,9 53:4 78:25 145:16
--	---	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[people - pharmacologically]

Page 46

people 32:8 35:23 61:17 97:18 111:24 117:14,16 117:18 118:4 121:22,23 122:13 123:16,24 146:14 146:17,21 152:8 171:12 185:16 186:6,16 187:12 187:21 188:14,18 195:10,14 196:1 200:2 204:5 213:20 221:15 244:1 people's 81:5,11 percent 29:9,21 71:13 81:13,23 82:5 94:14 96:14 114:7,7 117:22 119:17 121:8 122:7 123:8,10 124:8 145:25 152:7,12,13,14 154:15 155:18,18 155:23,23 156:4 156:16 187:13 190:8,10 222:13 242:11 248:11 298:5 percentage 56:2 70:20 71:7,9,14,16 71:22 72:22 73:12 74:4,9 77:8 85:12 86:12 87:15 112:23 114:16,25 115:10,13 120:17 124:5 137:22 144:1 145:20 163:13,15 164:19 165:7,12 166:3 206:7	percentages 81:18 114:10 123:22 124:16 percocet 273:4 percodin 273:3 perform 224:4 performed 136:2 performing 191:23 period 28:17 79:10,19,20 131:7 146:11 148:24 229:17 264:25 266:20 periodic 181:13 periods 136:13 permission 100:7 permitting 167:3 perpetrate 306:9 person 52:11 131:5 148:23 196:13,16 197:1,6 197:16 229:2,4 247:17 248:4 270:20 271:2 302:24 303:14 309:18 personal 113:3 173:6 210:12 212:7 224:13 225:20 227:8 personalized 201:20 202:2,6 personalizing 202:10 personally 47:24 150:8 186:6 306:3 personnel 160:17 persons 118:6 120:19 121:10 131:13,14,18,18	131:25 177:5 248:18,20 249:5 253:23 perspective 58:8,9 58:11,16 92:2 268:21 persuaded 191:14 pertains 130:23 pharm 81:22 pharma 209:7 291:5 301:5,17,18 302:8 pharmaceutical 7:4,5 14:18,18 24:21,25 25:7 33:13 35:21,25 37:5,10 38:4,10 39:5 61:24 62:4,9 62:10,10 66:6 68:12,22 69:12,22 70:1,5,9,15 76:20 81:8 88:8,16 89:9 116:1 169:22,25 174:14 176:25 177:11,17 179:24 180:6 272:11 295:25 308:9 pharmaceuticals 7:3 14:17 257:15 289:2 301:4 308:2 308:20 pharmacies 24:6 24:14 25:18 30:5 30:8,25 33:14,17 34:2 35:10,17 38:19,21 48:23 50:10 68:16 81:14 81:24,25 82:6 84:3,19 85:3 87:9 128:20 129:22 130:12,18 138:2	143:18 144:8,12 144:16 192:2 274:9 292:10 303:9 pharmacist 82:14 82:24 83:2 97:14 138:15,19 139:4 139:19,21,24 140:7 141:21,21 142:12 143:6,11 161:1 164:10,16 257:24 261:23,24 283:6 pharmacist's 143:7 pharmacists 30:14 30:17,19 82:18 83:6,11 128:18 132:19 134:15 135:5,12,13,16,20 135:22 136:2,11 136:15,17 137:4 138:10,23 140:1 140:24 142:1,3,6,9 142:18,20,25 160:20 164:5,24 164:25 192:2 pharmacodynamic 202:22 pharmacodynam... 203:3 pharmacoecono... 169:10 pharmacokinetic 202:22 pharmacokinetics 203:3 pharmacological 313:6,17 pharmacologically 171:18
--	--	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[pharmacy - population]

Page 47

pharmacy 24:23 30:3 31:5 33:15 33:23 34:4 48:13 48:21 49:2,4,20 50:2,6,14 71:3 74:5 85:8 86:5,16 91:15 114:12 127:21,25 128:2,7 128:11,14 129:10 129:12,15,18 130:2,4,10,20 131:23 132:1,13 132:15 135:17,18 136:7 137:2,23 138:20 139:11 141:3,5,9 143:11 143:12 144:1,2 164:9,16,20 165:8 166:3 230:22 pharmacy's 33:19 33:22 phenomenologic... 195:17 313:14 phenomenon 163:23 313:12 phobia 109:9 phone 170:16 phrase 310:16 phraseology 312:14 phrasing 179:5 physical 90:13 126:13 194:1,13 313:5,16 physically 204:5 physician 24:15 32:13 60:19 61:12 99:19 141:18 142:10 159:9 162:22,25 204:10 204:21 213:5	223:7 268:2,21 280:11,12 physician's 102:5 104:13 physicians 32:19 61:2 141:13 143:1 163:19 203:13 204:14,24 205:11 222:17 223:2 224:3 269:6 279:22 280:1 296:24 297:6 306:24 physiologic 245:23 physiologically 165:19 pic 244:21 pick 14:1 picture 258:23 piece 42:6 59:24 150:23 217:22 245:4 pieces 106:14 119:10 150:25 pill 26:21,23,25 39:16 40:18,22 88:13 95:19 124:25 139:20,22 206:21 207:5 250:1,4 pills 23:25 24:7,13 25:21,24 26:2,15 27:4,10 28:12,16 28:20,20 29:1 34:8,13 39:15 48:13 52:8,11,19 54:3,8,12,15 70:19 70:25 71:1,8,16 72:7,12 76:1,3 81:10 84:2,4	86:21 89:4 96:20 98:3 117:17 137:18 193:5,7 207:2 210:8 244:19 261:10 pincus 9:14 15:21 15:21,22 pivot 247:2 pivotal 178:11 place 13:25 16:21 74:15 157:2 177:25 213:11 214:21 217:20 218:16 234:14 316:7 placebo 186:22 189:1 265:10,14 265:23 283:24 284:3,14 places 33:15 72:20 275:2 292:9 plaintiff 3:3 4:3 15:10,15 plaintiffs 15:3,5 16:1 17:25 18:21 19:10 20:2,6,11,14 21:7,12 55:19 56:6 166:14,22 plan 149:13 plane 56:7 plausible 142:5 play 30:17 83:10 135:22 143:7 played 34:12 107:10 112:25 113:5 116:25 117:3 please 13:24 14:5 16:3,6,24 17:14 18:7,10 167:10 174:2 234:15	239:19 240:2 264:21 266:15 286:15 298:10 300:20 308:13 pleasers 111:23 plenty 200:3 pllc 4:4 plus 135:21 185:22 pmp 132:7 point 40:13 65:14 74:24 93:22 115:14 118:8,14 151:4 153:7,10,17 178:1,14 180:14 187:15 188:11 191:8 198:5 209:6 218:14 224:6 241:17,21 245:3 270:14 282:9 299:24 points 257:12 police 52:8,11 98:6 98:9 216:8 244:23 policies 135:17 178:2,16,21 policy 77:4 102:1 102:16,21 103:10 298:14,22 299:3,9 299:15 poorly 231:4 population 23:19 24:7 115:8 118:12 137:20 152:11 154:16 155:17 183:25 200:19 210:11 219:2,5,24 220:8,14 233:8,12 233:16,21 234:8 252:11 253:23 284:6
---	---	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[populations - prescribing]

Page 48

populations 157:9 229:7	power 100:9 112:13 231:7	preadolescent 227:22	45:9 47:24 48:13 51:23 52:1,4,7
porter 6:15 7:6 14:14,14,16	ppsg 12:2 286:1	precautions 135:13	53:10,23 54:8 70:20 71:9,15
portfolio 172:13	practical 110:4	precedes 117:10	74:4,10,13 84:8
portion 72:4 145:11 178:13	practice 32:24 33:5 36:21,24 41:2 44:11,12,21 45:4,10 48:18 50:23 55:8 61:4 76:23 77:3 82:25 89:18 90:4 93:21 94:2 96:9 97:6,11 97:14 100:19 105:9,25 160:2,6 196:11 199:5 204:17 206:16 208:4,13 209:9 211:7 215:13 232:2,4 256:5 268:17,19,19 269:4,10,16,19,24 269:25 282:23 295:23 307:1 314:14	precursor 174:9	85:1 89:20 90:9 93:23 98:25 102:3 102:18 103:3,12 106:8 109:18 114:17 115:12 123:25 124:5 159:10 162:19 180:16 181:6 199:16,21,24,25 200:1,6,16,18,24 201:6 205:11 206:20 207:1,8 208:4,23 211:9 212:1 216:4,14,20 229:18 230:13 246:19 256:7 262:22 263:3 268:21 304:11,20
position 51:16 81:17,21 218:19 219:2 269:22 283:17		predates 42:3 109:19	
positive 43:23 217:12 228:18		predecessors 299:18	
possession 90:13		predicting 228:21	
possibility 186:20		predictive 227:20 228:23 229:11	
possible 59:10,17 59:19 142:25 147:8 148:23 245:10 291:5,8		preface 186:10	
possibly 26:2 27:24 81:20 193:7		premarked 154:4	
post 28:10,18 126:17 190:4 191:19 192:19		preparation 308:20	
postal 251:14		prepare 145:11	
postdate 263:21		preparing 128:9 302:2	
postdates 263:18		prescribe 32:22 43:15,24,25 44:2,3 44:12 45:12 46:10 46:18,25 47:7 48:8 50:7 54:3,12 59:24 73:5,9 76:17 84:23 86:7 90:1 95:22 99:15 100:7,17 104:1 105:9 106:1 109:8 111:19 112:5,21 118:23 124:3 184:2 200:7,9,11 201:2,11 204:25 208:12,16,17 209:16 211:10 230:25 231:7 282:10 305:6	
posthumous 158:23	practiced 55:2,7 196:23		prescriber 44:20 183:19 307:9 309:7
postoperative 74:11	practices 34:4 44:7 94:3,5,5,10 94:22 95:2 108:11 108:14 181:13		prescribers 40:12 40:16,19 87:25 92:25 99:24 173:8 173:16 174:1,5,11 175:1,7 191:14 192:1 197:24 272:5 278:22 280:3,16 284:15 292:20 294:4,6 306:14,19 307:5 309:12
postoperatively 74:13	practicing 24:15 83:1 85:6 86:2 159:17 163:19 230:8		
potential 37:2 38:9 97:17 150:15 182:17 184:6,19 203:8,15 284:21 306:21	practitioner 219:3 220:4		
potentially 159:5 253:8,22 256:2 314:1	practitioners 204:15 222:21 224:1	prescribed 29:15 32:1,15 33:1 35:5 40:2,8 43:17 45:5	prescribes 54:1 prescribing 11:21 11:24 29:9,16,21 31:11 32:21 33:5
	pre 11:18 236:19		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[prescribing - previously]

Page 49

33:9 40:16,23,25 43:20,21 44:8,9 45:1,16 48:16 52:18 54:18,20 68:23 71:3 73:23 74:2 76:22 77:13 80:8 82:21 83:25 85:23 93:2,4,6 94:18 95:12 97:1 97:20 98:4 99:21 100:4 101:16 102:5 103:5 104:13,22 105:13 106:11,12,12,15 106:15 108:25 110:1 111:13,16 112:3,25 131:2,12 131:20 139:24 140:18 162:22,25 170:14 172:6 177:14 180:21 181:13,23 182:1,6 182:19 183:17 184:8,20 200:2,20 204:3,10 205:23 207:16,19 209:3,4 209:8,18,20,23 213:4 231:10 245:11 246:16 248:2,5,17,19 250:20,24 252:18 252:22 253:2,7,12 258:17 263:1 269:22 271:14 272:1 280:1,12,17 282:9 290:13,22 292:9 293:3,13 294:2,4,14,19 302:20 305:7 307:2	prescription 28:3 30:4,9,11,12,13,21 31:1,6 33:14,18,21 33:24 34:8 39:8 47:12 49:3,13,16 49:19 51:1 52:6 54:1,9,16 58:4,12 58:24 63:8 64:3 65:3,9 69:4 71:4,4 71:21 72:2,5,10,20 72:23 73:10,10,13 75:2,5,5,19,22 76:13,21 80:6 82:19 83:12,24 87:3,8,24 88:4,7 88:23 89:10,12,15 90:12,13 91:2,8,19 92:9,24 93:1 94:13 104:10 113:7,22 114:11 114:17 115:1,3,11 116:12,19,23,24 117:4,5,9 118:5,9 118:21 119:1,14 119:18 121:23 122:14,19,22 123:5,12 124:25 132:9,21,22,22 134:6,6 136:4,12 139:8 162:3 164:24 165:2 183:5 185:1,4,7 187:11 191:20 192:19 205:6 208:12,17,23 210:1,10,12,18 213:16 220:1 227:18,19 231:3 233:3 242:12,14 243:17 245:6,7,18 246:9,16,20 248:8	249:7,17 250:7 252:10 253:7,17 253:21 255:15 257:23 258:2,19 261:15,17,25 263:11,15 268:14 271:10,17,24 279:7,23 281:17 281:22,25 282:14 282:25 283:9 285:12 292:25 294:10 295:12,21 302:25 303:16 309:10,21 prescriptions 39:11 48:24 50:22 71:17,23 73:12,18 74:17 76:2 77:11 81:4 82:1,7,10,15 83:16,17 85:12 86:13 92:6 123:17 131:1,8,13,14,17 131:18,25 133:7,8 133:8,22 138:5 139:22 140:2 144:9,13,17 161:22 162:4,4,13 162:18,24 163:1,7 163:16,21 164:4 164:19 165:7 166:3 180:24 205:16 206:7 207:13,24 208:3,3 208:5 210:20 247:16 248:9,18 249:4,9,12 255:12 278:15 295:5,9 297:13,24 present 9:21 14:4 60:14 198:1 261:14,17	presentation 62:15 151:8 290:2 290:3,4,7 291:1,24 292:2 presented 61:20 61:22,24 62:11 65:17,22 presenter 128:2 presenters 61:21 presenting 83:15 187:21 188:14 199:1 presently 252:18 press 64:21 80:14 129:20 206:25 pressure 110:14 111:7 pressures 204:16 204:19,24 prestigious 69:10 presumably 262:3 266:25 prevailing 262:25 prevalence 118:11 152:7 154:13,14 155:16,22 156:6 156:15,25,25 229:9 prevalent 119:6 prevent 81:3 181:20 182:11,19 184:7,20 prevention 123:1 208:15 246:17 previous 118:7 197:16 previously 31:9 93:2 106:7 191:9 208:25 211:6 270:2 304:17 312:4
--	---	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[pricing - provide]

Page 50

pricing 302:16	232:22 243:25	80:17 169:24	promotion 294:1
primarily 94:10	253:9,22 258:18	185:20 191:24	promotional 36:21
194:6,18	281:25 282:7	308:23	68:24 105:14
primary 44:22	problems 59:13	professionals	173:18 174:19
45:4 51:20 52:15	93:15 94:20	118:23	195:3 209:5 287:5
133:15 269:21	124:24 177:13	professor 17:1,5	287:9,12 288:25
printed 18:21	183:20 191:17	69:10	289:3 290:10
prior 31:22 32:7	224:5,10 228:20	profiles 202:22	293:12 295:14,22
50:11 58:17 60:3	233:1 241:11	profit 37:10	302:7 307:23,24
71:2 83:19 118:4	294:22	107:19	308:19 309:3
119:18 120:20,23	procedures 191:12	profits 37:19,22	prompt 217:2
121:4 135:1	proceeding 27:24	prognosis 182:24	propagated 109:6
212:23 222:10	proceedings 13:3	183:9	proper 181:12,12
231:22 235:19	156:21 226:13,18	prognosticate	181:14,20,22,25
243:9 251:5	226:21 248:14	233:9	182:11,19 184:8
284:11 295:16	316:14	program 17:6	184:21 213:13
priori 285:2	process 46:6 76:18	170:25 237:2,4,18	266:13 267:23
private 14:2 56:7	210:19 252:25	304:23 305:8,14	269:23
privileges 100:4	273:12	305:19	properly 212:1
probable 60:2	prochaska 166:8	progress 122:15	223:7 306:6
probably 50:1	proctor 166:18	122:21	proportion 122:24
62:1,3 65:5 66:6	produce 175:17	progressed 122:19	proposal 92:4
158:21 181:17	produced 68:7	progressing 117:7	proposition
195:18 200:10,13	128:10 238:22	progression	181:12,19 182:17
201:9 212:16	278:20 286:24	118:17	183:12 184:5,14
214:22 268:25	288:14,18 314:2	prohibited 93:8	185:16 193:12,18
285:10	product 35:21	prolific 31:12	193:24 195:20
problem 33:11	249:17 296:16	40:19	222:21 223:20,25
36:1 38:11 39:6	305:25	prologue 206:24	224:19 225:4
40:11,20,21 58:20	production 87:9	prolonged 152:25	226:2
60:2 64:7,12,15,18	productive 146:25	298:2	propositions
64:24 65:7,16,16	products 62:7	promote 62:6	193:10 222:5
72:1 73:25 74:1	172:24 173:1	69:13 108:25	prosecuted 102:2
76:17 83:20 92:21	200:4 231:12	110:1 231:11	102:18 103:11
107:9 140:11	287:17,18 290:5	258:17 259:22	protocol 202:18
155:16,22 164:23	290:20 295:6	296:25	protocols 204:17
198:25 210:9	302:1,19,20,22	promoted 102:22	proven 189:8
214:5,6,20 218:14	profession 64:17	104:9 252:12	223:16
218:16 222:3,11	116:2 204:1	302:15 308:23	provide 18:1 21:6
222:14 223:23	professional 47:4	promoting 107:2	48:3 54:7 57:1,3
225:17,21 232:8	53:25 69:1 70:6		85:13,15 95:1

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[provide - question]

Page 51

104:18 112:23 118:22 123:24 136:11 144:20 145:22 158:20 165:6,11 166:2 191:5 198:12 270:9,12,16,16 271:5 provided 62:16,23 63:8 64:2 65:3 66:24 67:19 81:12 81:23 92:9 154:22 155:1 256:15 257:20 275:13 288:15 305:15,20 provider 93:8,9 119:14 210:20 provider's 93:11 183:4 providers 45:15 46:1 74:16 83:17 140:12 141:1 149:10 153:2 204:14,15 218:13 228:13,16 283:5 284:15 292:8 provides 154:7 266:24 providing 20:20 85:25 psychiatric 44:10 44:11 45:4 156:10 228:2,7 229:24 psychiatrist 44:14 47:19 66:3 149:6 209:8 237:8 255:24 psychiatry 17:20 59:12 123:6 psychoactive 193:15,23	psychological 44:15 psychotropic 80:9 public 36:7 37:17 52:17 58:2 59:6 80:12,15 108:7 116:2 137:10 183:25 193:3 202:7 218:13 302:15 315:25 publication 59:20 114:24 publications 60:6 publicly 107:1,7 publish 58:9 104:21 published 58:7 59:1,3 60:5 64:13 64:21 101:25,25 104:9 105:7,8,23 105:24 149:18 248:16 294:4,18 302:7 308:19,25 309:3 publishing 106:23 puffy 243:14 pull 93:23 punish 103:19 punished 103:4,21 purchase 105:3 purchasers 28:7 purdue 175:22,23 pure 240:21 241:22 purportedly 173:9 174:5 purpose 72:2,12 73:8,14,18 161:24 162:15 163:9,24 163:25 276:14 296:25	purposes 71:24 72:13,24 73:2,6 74:2 159:18,21 160:9,13,17,21,24 163:18 164:3 193:14,22 263:18 287:10 302:2 pursuant 71:16 87:24 89:11 135:1 push 177:14 194:7 put 16:16 138:1 154:21 157:14 186:11 188:24 197:25 206:3 225:23 238:16 261:6 268:9 269:22 287:15 putting 23:19 24:7 137:19 147:11 186:10 204:7 pyser 5:6 14:9 22:3,3 167:14 q qualifier 160:24 165:12 qualify 30:9 43:23 44:6 168:7 182:22 203:18 211:12 212:23 213:14 225:10 268:12 278:21 310:19 qualitative 162:11 178:8,9,10 293:7 294:21 quality 108:1,1,8 108:10,13,21,22 108:24 109:2 110:1,24 quantified 112:19 176:4,6 177:5 180:14	quantify 71:19 73:19 112:22 113:2 176:5,8,12 176:13 177:9 178:1,7,14 179:9 205:21 212:24 235:11,16 294:1 294:16 quantifying 176:1 176:20 179:1 294:12 quantitative 114:23 293:25 294:7,9,17 quantities 129:23 quarters 123:3 question 21:3 22:4 22:9,17 26:11,13 27:11 31:3,4 34:17 41:12,19 46:9,13,16 47:13 47:14 52:24 53:3 53:4,5 57:17,20,20 59:15 62:8 63:25 65:11 69:19 71:25 72:14,15,22 78:19 78:19,21,24,25 79:2,9,13,22 81:21 82:4 84:6,21 85:18 86:10 88:15 91:20 97:4 102:7 103:8 105:22 109:25 113:17,18 113:21 115:10 122:1 123:16 133:19 134:13 135:7,10 136:15 138:3,8 141:5,8,23 143:16 144:5 145:19 147:16,17 147:25 156:23
---	--	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[question - reason]

Page 52

157:23 158:14 161:10 164:22 165:5 168:23 169:7 172:16 173:13,24 174:3,9 175:4,11 178:19 179:15 181:18,22 182:23 184:14 186:10,12,15 187:1,16 189:12 190:19 196:12 198:6 201:23 202:13 207:21 220:21 227:10,13 227:15,22 232:13 233:14,19 235:2,5 239:3 242:21 254:6 259:25 262:19 268:6,6 270:23,25 273:13 278:25 279:3,12 279:14,17 280:7 281:4 287:20 288:13 289:8,13 290:16,24,25 291:21 296:6,8 297:3 301:19 303:4 305:17 308:24 309:15 question's 22:9 questioning 278:19 questions 10:19 126:12 127:11,17 159:15 167:2,4 178:25 179:6 193:10 247:3,5 265:19 270:4 296:22 300:1 303:7,10,12 307:21 310:9	313:4,23 314:10 quick 236:16 265:19,20 270:4 300:1 quickly 186:5 233:1 237:20 298:9 quit 147:13 148:2 148:9,16 quota 113:6,10,18 113:21 114:1 quotas 113:14,15 114:3 quote 28:4 60:9 109:5,9 157:6 230:10 quoted 120:2 quotes 156:4 quoting 28:4 r r 7:7 radical 31:14 32:3 32:5 radio 80:25 rain 251:20 raise 16:5 282:1,2 raising 195:13 random 93:5 randomize 284:12 randomized 263:5 265:14 283:24 284:2 range 54:7,12,14 152:7 ranges 150:3 rapidly 54:20 rare 87:19 94:13 109:16 162:7 163:5 185:20 191:3 205:22 211:15	rarified 284:6 rate 19:22 28:14 110:13,13 111:7 111:12 112:10,12 144:20 145:7 218:12 248:17,20 rated 231:3 rates 29:2 72:17 83:25 84:7,22 85:10 86:7 91:25 131:12 140:19 174:21 rating 112:17 ratings 112:14,15 ratio 234:12 235:17 ratios 122:19 raw 137:22 reach 27:12 251:19 287:3 reaching 66:16 286:20 292:2 read 23:3,5 27:16 31:17 62:19 63:22 69:5 78:22 80:24 103:14 105:12 121:20 123:7 125:3 129:8 154:17,19 155:11 155:13,19,24 156:2,4,18 168:11 168:25 169:3 184:4 193:18 241:22 242:18,22 243:2,7 244:4 248:15 266:15 293:2 314:12,16 315:3 readily 24:1 78:1 85:7 86:4 122:12 258:13	reading 37:16 77:15 151:19 234:1 240:6,17,23 246:21 264:21 readings 129:21 reads 121:17 155:21 ready 26:6 86:4 real 8:15 225:2 232:19 236:16 276:9 283:12 284:5,8 realize 63:23 265:19 311:23 realized 211:7 245:1 really 21:10 34:19 45:23 49:7 53:12 54:11,21 56:22,23 71:20,25 85:17 91:25 106:14 112:7,16 113:12 113:15 114:2,14 117:19 123:12 142:7,14,16 152:4 157:1 164:8 182:22 189:12,13 191:15 195:25 201:1 203:24 212:6 213:8 225:9 225:12 243:14 245:3,8,24 262:17 269:23 282:7 297:15 299:11 306:1 reask 133:19 165:5 reason 44:6 96:15 111:5 141:20 142:11 199:1 214:19 236:4
--	--	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[reason - regarding]

Page 53

249:2 270:18,18 reasonable 215:10 reasons 190:16 197:20 246:14 reassessment 191:7 reassure 102:2,17 103:11 recall 57:12 60:11 60:21 61:21 62:1 62:12,14 87:5 128:4,24 132:24 134:18 135:25 136:19 138:13,25 141:15 143:9 196:20 237:4 238:25 247:13 251:12,25 255:13 256:16 270:7 288:4 304:13 recalling 290:3 305:11 receive 72:2 142:3 142:19,20 174:3 175:16 261:24 275:20 276:4 284:13,14 received 18:21 20:23 21:11 50:10 67:9 93:16 152:3 175:8 210:20 246:24 287:9 291:4 307:4 receives 142:12 230:12 receiving 71:3 93:16 107:21 233:3 285:12 298:6 receptor 190:15 203:6	recess 55:15 90:22 127:7 167:13 215:23 272:20 recipient 63:4,20 275:15,25 287:4 recipients 115:6 173:17 174:19 reciprocal 20:18 21:21 55:23 recognition 93:21 recognize 124:21 recognizing 52:16 recollection 200:15,17,20 201:11 238:13 recommend 45:11 46:10 147:6 185:1 185:11 recommendation 48:7 recommendations 44:17 47:6 48:3 recommended 46:18 182:25 recommending 45:20,22 83:3 record 13:10 14:1 16:17,22,24 55:13 55:16 56:23 90:20 90:23 93:14 127:5 127:8 167:3,9,11 167:15 178:6 180:11 197:5,10 197:15,19,25 198:3,8,10 215:21 215:24 226:22,23 226:25 227:1 236:15,16,17,21 236:22 239:10,11 239:13,14 243:3,7 250:12,15,17	251:1 272:18,21 285:18,21,23 286:3 300:20,21 300:23,24 309:24 309:25 310:2,3 313:25 314:18,21 315:5 316:14 recorded 316:11 recording 13:24 records 51:13 57:4 270:13 recovery 210:19 211:23 recreational 76:11 recruit 284:7 reduce 81:10 223:10 253:13 258:20 reduces 190:22 222:10 223:22 redundant 220:19 278:12 reed 6:14 14:14 reedsmith.com 6:19 reenforcing 223:18 reengaged 148:25 reevaluated 224:9 reevaluation 181:13 refer 27:20 28:1 29:4 42:11 51:9 59:14 70:23 84:9 114:20 207:16 234:20 237:6 279:11 303:6 308:7 reference 29:5 59:18,19 60:8 87:23 101:20	117:9 123:2 180:19 236:11 247:12,20 264:7 265:9 300:15,17 referenced 87:2 158:10 207:19 314:3,7 references 29:15 29:18 154:24 265:21 291:3 referencing 34:6 referred 59:10,17 107:16 126:11 168:16,25 235:2 252:2 304:3 referring 23:17,18 66:23 172:23 257:10 264:11,16 272:12 273:14 299:12 refers 137:17 refills 74:19 227:16,17 reflected 129:1,3 134:20 refuse 165:22 refused 164:20 166:4 refusing 164:24 165:15 refute 248:4 regain 148:14 regard 143:15 213:13 232:9 regarding 25:11 32:20 37:22 38:19 49:15 58:22 60:6 62:17 63:19 64:10 88:13 100:3 128:17 129:15 131:20 140:13,16
--	--	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[regarding - report]

Page 54

145:20 166:2 168:2 169:1 174:14 175:3,14 182:23 207:13 212:24 216:24 246:10 257:10 268:15 274:1,4,16 274:20 275:4,7 276:16 295:16 303:8 309:14 regardless 232:6 regards 134:11 regimen 201:20 202:2 216:6 230:18 244:17 region 24:1 34:14 39:3,16,17,17 85:6 86:3 140:19 regions 28:25 29:2 38:19,22 54:19 89:3 registrant 171:3 registrant's 171:10 regression 173:2,6 292:15,17,23 regret 76:23 regular 47:3,6 48:19 93:18 209:3 268:25 regularly 47:9 65:15 93:13 regulations 100:3 258:13 275:5,8 regulatory 25:8,15 reimbursed 145:3 reimbursement 108:9 178:20 reinforcing 190:16 rejected 116:7	rela 25:15 relapsed 241:10 241:15 243:14 relapsing 146:13 relate 273:9 related 21:12 29:14,22 83:21 94:20 131:6 153:25 196:17 266:12 313:13,14 316:17 relates 41:2 relating 25:7 27:3 relationship 30:22 93:4 136:18 137:3 137:25 245:5 relationships 234:5 relative 30:15 230:1 233:21 relatively 306:12 release 101:15 224:20 225:23,25 226:5,11 244:24 246:9 254:2 266:16 303:25 305:3 306:4 released 102:1,4 103:10 104:15 releasing 126:25 relevant 57:18 83:21 136:13 199:1,2 242:21,21 reliable 122:4,6 124:4 153:4 157:5 184:3 185:23 187:5,25 266:24 283:18,23 reliance 256:25 relied 151:13 173:9 174:6	259:22 268:19 279:22 280:11 286:12,14,16,20 286:22 291:15 292:5,6 relief 112:6 190:3 260:18 284:20 311:15,19 312:2 312:12 reliever 120:8,18 120:20 121:1,14 relievers 31:23 121:12,12 reluctant 50:20 56:22 197:25 198:2 201:23 205:14 311:7,15 311:19 312:2,11 rely 150:25 151:18 189:20 192:11 292:1 relying 27:16 36:15 250:8 287:10,23 remained 54:16 remains 199:12 remember 98:10 126:2 278:8 287:14 305:23 307:7 remembered 200:21 remembering 98:8 remind 161:8 remission 146:10 146:14,18 remitting 146:13 rems 289:18,19,25 304:23 305:1,4,8 305:14,19 306:3,4 307:1,19	renders 39:25 reneges 39:22,24 repeat 26:11,13 31:2 168:22 225:2 305:17 313:16 repeated 98:3 repetitive 278:9 rephrase 41:12 141:23 163:20 172:16 297:3 311:10,24 report 11:7 13:7 18:1,4,12,14,17,25 19:7 20:8 22:15 27:20,22 28:1,2,4 28:15,19 29:4,7 31:11 36:13,14 41:4,8,9,14,16,21 41:23,24 42:1,7,8 42:15,16 49:15 52:8,10 59:9 60:8 60:17 62:13 66:15 67:4 68:3,13,14,19 68:21 70:23,24 74:15 77:16 78:8 84:9,12 86:25,25 87:5,23 92:4 96:9 97:6,11,11,12,13 97:24 98:5,7,11 101:20 105:15 107:12 109:22 111:22 114:4,20 116:6 117:9,22 118:1,3,19 119:12 119:16 120:14,15 124:16,20 125:20 125:22 126:8,11 128:5,9 129:2,8,10 129:11 130:22 133:2,3 134:9,12 134:21 136:24
--	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[report - result]

Page 55

137:12,14,16 139:2 140:9,10,15 144:19 158:18 159:4,5 161:15 175:22 179:13 180:19 187:9 188:21 189:16 207:16 216:8 218:4 219:7,17 221:13 233:23 234:15 235:15 247:12,20,20 248:1,13,15,24 253:15 265:10 273:15 274:8 275:1,12 276:2,4,7 276:14,18,25 277:22,25 278:5 281:18,22 282:5 282:21 283:1,2,3,3 283:8,16 286:12 287:3,25 288:2,9 288:23 289:16 291:15,16,18,25 292:9,12 293:3 300:11 302:6 307:22 308:8 314:4 reported 1:23 75:14 89:19 118:4 118:6 123:8,10 156:25 158:9 217:9 reporter 2:18 13:22 16:3,5,11 226:22 reporting 74:18 75:12,21 reports 25:24 26:18 27:9,9,17,18 27:18,19 28:4	42:5,12,19 70:24 80:14 129:20 157:7,20 189:24 190:3 192:23,24 206:25 207:4 274:14 represent 14:5 18:20 28:15 51:10 127:17 144:3 251:6 260:3 263:14 272:24 286:9 288:6 291:17 298:16 299:3 301:3 303:24 310:8 representation 34:20 250:8 representative 115:7 277:23 278:1 284:8 representatives 61:23 62:9 116:2 represented 225:1 representing 31:14 163:22 represents 294:22 reproduce 273:22 reps 294:25 requested 238:22 require 224:21 225:6 226:6 268:11 required 60:20 61:2,13 66:11 150:25 191:7 268:3 305:5 306:19 requirement 65:22 66:5,12 requirements 142:9	requires 147:14 261:25 262:23 305:14,20 307:9 research 66:4 74:25 109:20 209:13 researched 24:15 171:13 reserve 314:10 residency 17:20 61:3 63:14,21 197:22 200:1 209:2 213:3 282:8 resident 160:12 213:5 residential 147:21 residents 64:7 246:4 resistant 243:12 resources 95:1 204:2 respect 44:7 129:14 132:13 134:13 172:13 176:8 178:19,25 205:6 235:9 239:5 281:5 287:23 291:19 292:5 298:17 306:8 respectfully 133:18 294:3 respond 183:2 230:8 response 29:6 30:24 43:23 79:20 135:1,11 183:7 211:13 217:21 259:4 308:15 responsibilities 25:8,15 73:4 91:10 93:10,11	135:20 137:9 responsibility 30:5,10,14 34:21 36:2,3,6 37:6 38:5 38:7 39:5,23,24 51:21 52:16 64:11 82:11 88:13 89:15 91:1,12,13,18 92:2 115:25 128:18,21 129:15,19 130:15 132:20 133:6,17 133:21 134:1,5,10 134:16 135:4,8,12 138:6 139:25 140:7 177:1,6,10 178:11,11,15 179:10 180:4 192:9,12,12 193:2 193:8 246:10 305:6 responsible 32:13 83:1 102:4 104:13 104:22 105:12 177:16 179:18 191:23 192:18 235:22 246:5 rest 75:3 84:4 146:15 162:8 174:20 222:14 248:19 259:3 restate 224:25 restrictions 106:7 result 40:11 66:6 78:2 84:16,17 152:24 245:12 249:16,21 277:19 280:19 295:22 296:4,10,15 298:2 302:21,24 303:15 309:20 311:3 312:18 313:2,19
---	--	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[resulted - rotted]

Page 56

resulted 23:7,13 242:14	44:4 47:23,25 48:1 52:22 56:11	222:10 223:10,15 224:4,12,19 225:4	204:1
results 146:25	66:17,22 67:24	225:15,16,17,20	rochester 9:12
resumed 209:17	79:23 84:6 85:25	225:24 226:4	15:23 69:20
retail 28:7 87:9 127:21,25 128:7 135:17	87:10,11 88:1,5,6 90:14 92:16,17 96:10,11 97:3,9 100:20,21 103:9	227:3,7,21,23,24 228:2,12,14,17,19 228:19,24 229:3,8 229:9,16,19,22,22	101:11 104:18
retain 19:10	104:10,11,23,24 106:1,2 117:24	229:23,25 230:1,2 231:21 232:7,7,12	rockwood 1:24
retained 17:25 166:15	119:19,22 120:21 121:7,8,20 124:19	232:15,15,16,17 233:21 234:8,11 234:13,23,24	2:17 13:23 316:4 316:25
reuptake 259:9	126:9,14 130:7 133:18 155:6,13 167:25 186:3	235:8,11,16,23 245:9 253:19	rocky 7:16 14:20
reversed 233:11	191:13 197:17 199:20 203:25	263:8,9,11 284:22 285:11 305:1 306:11 312:6	rocky.tsai 7:20
review 11:12 43:1 119:25 130:20 157:3,20 197:5 198:20,22,23 203:14 276:20 277:1,12,20 288:21 289:5,6,9 301:21	204:7 207:6 208:11 210:5 211:11 217:14 220:10 240:10,10 240:16,20 246:20 250:11 256:3 257:25 265:22 270:20 287:19 292:16 295:9 299:25 300:7 305:12 313:24 314:10	risks 30:18 53:23 62:15 64:19 135:23 136:3 165:1 182:18 184:6,19 185:25 186:23 189:1 191:7 203:15 204:5,10 206:13 222:8,23 223:4,8 223:19,22 225:11 230:2 306:6,20,23 307:10 309:8	rodgers 8:14 10:15 14:24,24 310:6,7,15,20 311:1,13,25 312:17 313:15,22
reviewed 67:22 119:11 128:13 130:22 131:16,19 132:7 140:23 207:15 256:14 267:3,9 277:16 286:20 287:2 288:15 289:1 293:16 301:24 302:3 306:3,4 308:16,22 309:1	ring 132:6 rising 77:17 137:17	risky 187:18 194:9 rivera 8:5 10:13 14:22,22 286:6,8 288:12 289:7,14 295:20 296:13 297:4,20 298:8,11 299:22 300:18	rogue 129:22
reviewing 206:19	risk 23:20 24:8 47:11 48:16 53:22 77:20 94:12 105:17 109:15,20 110:5 114:5 117:6 120:19 137:15,20 140:6 152:20 153:2,5,16 183:3 186:1 203:22	road 3:17 4:6 robert 166:18 robust 142:12,15 142:15 153:4	role 30:17,20 34:12 52:14 53:21 78:17,18 81:19 91:11 107:6,10 112:25 113:5,17 117:4 135:16,23 136:3 140:24,25 146:20 176:5,7 204:9 213:4 274:8 293:18 294:12
revised 260:9,12			roles 204:9
revisions 156:10			roll 11:18 236:19
reward 190:16 203:7			romanette 60:9 62:14 87:2 90:11 103:9
rewarding 203:7			room 14:4 111:5 147:2,5 167:14
right 16:5 17:2 29:16,25 30:1 31:23 35:1,5 41:17,18 42:23			root 26:13 ropes 7:15 14:20 ropesgray.com 7:20
			rosas 1:24 2:17 316:4,25
			rotted 243:20 244:12

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[route - see]

Page 57

route 202:23 203:4 rpr 1:24 2:17 316:4,25 rules 100:3 run 151:12 running 213:9,21 216:21 rushed 243:19 régime 202:10	samples 36:12,17 36:19 249:18 256:15 257:9,20 258:11 277:23 san 1:15 2:15 3:9 6:17 7:18 13:1,20 sat 146:2 satisfaction 111:18 112:20,25 113:4 204:20 saturated 289:4 save 244:2 savings 257:24 saw 29:2 63:22 76:4 84:24 98:2 294:19 saying 60:10 75:25 80:24 128:24 168:7 176:14 182:9 203:18 215:12 219:6 238:1 269:11 271:4 278:21 312:16 says 108:16 121:3 121:8 225:1 235:25 237:7 240:9,10 243:10 257:4,15,16,22,22 261:14 307:18 sbadala 4:9 scale 109:12,13 110:17 111:10,11 111:12 173:12 scan 159:1 scary 243:14 scenario 46:15 98:19 117:14 185:18,20 187:18 208:11 232:13 233:22	scenarios 140:8,10 268:7 schedule 44:12,25 144:20 258:7,10 258:12 schizophrenia 228:11 scholer 7:6 school 17:2,18,24 47:22 59:12 61:3 63:13,20 76:1,2 93:19 117:17 197:22 209:1 213:3 241:18 282:8 science 32:20,22 140:13 151:19 237:1 scientific 168:9 184:3 283:18,23 scope 44:11 91:24 191:24 209:9 215:10 245:16 246:3 scourge 23:1,9 139:8 183:21 screen 77:9 95:11 95:11 96:12,17 193:16 210:1 211:25 216:5,12 216:13 219:7 228:18 229:12 306:15 screened 222:8,23 screening 222:9 222:12,17 228:21 228:24 screens 77:5 93:3 scrutinize 25:20 26:15 27:3 91:13 139:23	scrutinizing 34:21 38:21 scrutiny 39:2 82:8 92:19 93:17 94:1 94:17 95:6 106:10 se 125:10 210:13 seal 108:4,7 sean 9:21 13:21 second 6:16 79:8 87:22,22 155:5 243:9 252:8 section 114:20 137:16 155:14 197:10 264:19 266:12 267:25 sections 275:2 sedated 244:13 sedative 140:5 sedatives 82:23 see 22:19,21 46:23 52:14 76:9 82:19 93:14 114:8 119:21 121:5 127:2 150:8,17 157:1 167:20 189:4 196:18 198:24 209:15 219:18 229:7,8 237:10,12 238:3 240:9,12,13,24 243:4,9 248:22 249:13 257:2,13 257:17,18 258:21 259:21 260:8,11 260:15,20,21 261:2,5,9,12,13,16 264:18 266:5,11 267:22 276:19 284:8 289:18 298:20 299:12 300:15 304:18
s			
safe 94:12 164:1,2 170:14 191:16 201:4 204:3 306:10 307:2 safely 44:23 46:1 165:23 safer 46:2 253:6 safety 30:22 32:20 37:4 64:10 69:3 132:16 136:18 137:2,24 140:13 sal 15:18,18 sale 88:5 sales 29:11,18,23 30:2 31:5 168:4 169:13,16 171:16 171:24 172:1,5,6,8 172:10,12,19,21 172:23 173:1,3 294:25 salt 149:7 salvatore 4:5 salve 244:20 sameness 171:15 171:17,19,21 samhsa 11:12 119:25 sample 115:5,5,7 258:4,6 284:6 285:6			

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[see - single]

Page 58

306:1 312:4 seeing 65:8 75:11 75:20 80:18 220:5 300:17 seek 72:12 311:7 311:19 312:2,11 seeking 76:11 192:8 227:15 seen 36:18,23 50:19 77:16 148:21 174:15 185:21 199:6,13 200:19,23 206:11 206:14 232:23 233:4 279:22,25 280:10 304:9 311:15 segment 264:3 seldom 95:9 selection 266:13 267:23 284:25 self 59:21 159:4 sell 38:8 301:23 302:12 selling 75:5 221:15 sells 301:8 302:1 sense 25:19 37:14 38:8 83:7 113:25 138:24 139:5,7,18 220:6 222:12 242:18 255:7 269:11 302:21 sensitive 14:1 sensitivity 96:13 sent 238:12,13 sentence 154:14 154:19 155:5,21 237:25 243:10 separate 161:10 179:6,10,11 194:1 194:12 195:6	229:13 301:10 septic 243:19 sequential 252:15 sequentially 243:6 271:19 series 22:19 237:21 247:3 266:5 serious 27:23 37:3 118:24 124:23 218:13 serve 288:2 300:5 service 251:14 serving 56:3 set 19:4 121:22 149:15 159:20 275:11 316:7 sets 113:6 setting 67:25 74:11 141:18 147:4,21,23 148:10 150:15,18 151:6 160:2 201:14 263:8 305:16,22 seven 209:25 210:2 239:25 severe 150:3 152:24 231:22 260:19 264:23 266:18 267:20 severity 205:5 sexual 227:23 shakes 168:21 share 254:23 255:1,5,7 295:8 sharpen 211:13 she'd 244:6 shelf 34:9 shift 22:24 23:7,12 23:16,21,21,23,23	24:2,4 31:14 40:4 40:14,23,25 41:1 59:22 66:8 68:23 80:22 123:13 290:21 shine 251:20 ship 33:14 49:4,20 114:12 193:5 shipped 27:10 39:15 50:15 shipping 84:2 shkolnik 4:4 15:19 shock 77:7 shocked 287:14 304:18 shopping 82:20 87:25 227:13,17 231:24 233:6 short 16:18 53:19 53:23 54:2 112:5 182:25 183:10 187:3,6,17 200:7 225:10,14 226:11 242:22 247:2 255:11 268:25 269:7,17 304:6 307:17 shorthand 2:18 show 18:6 84:12 111:11 118:8,14 122:6,20 175:13 177:4 185:24 223:14,21 260:2 261:7 276:21 showed 32:20 showing 28:25 29:21 36:18 74:9 74:14 123:3 131:16 140:17 153:4 182:7 187:5 187:7,10 263:5	283:19 285:13 307:19 shows 28:11 29:9 114:5 152:6 shroeder 187:10 side 190:23 203:15 252:23 sides 20:20 240:1 sign 110:9,11,12 110:19,23 111:2,4 111:15 275:24 312:21,24 314:13 314:16 signature 316:24 significance 111:1 111:3 significant 66:1 112:6 116:13 117:4 187:8 190:22 194:22 signs 110:15 192:18 224:22 225:7 226:7 similar 65:17 93:1 100:4 157:23 171:18,18 195:18 203:1 278:18 303:7 similarity 194:23 similarly 248:19 249:19 281:12 simple 22:9 165:14 223:3 simpler 31:4 147:25 simplifies 164:23 simply 72:15 165:22 single 85:7,8 86:3 86:5 187:10 206:20,20,21
--	--	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[single - specificity]

Page 59

207:1,1,2 210:23 211:2 249:20 271:17,24 272:7 278:11 302:23 303:14 309:18 sit 34:8 299:13,22 site 243:12 sits 74:5 sitting 27:21 42:14 46:17 57:1,8 74:20 81:4,10 123:23 124:14,17 137:21 164:18 166:1 200:14 232:19 276:22 292:4 situation 45:18,24 72:16 89:17 90:5 91:4 98:8 147:11 159:25 161:5 175:24 176:3,22 211:19 216:23 217:7 218:3 221:6 231:2,4 269:20 situations 201:12 six 28:17 239:25 241:9 243:11 244:16 286:23 287:24 288:14,22 size 254:15 255:8 skepticism 63:19 65:6 152:2 skill 316:15 skills 167:23 skin 242:17 slides 291:4,6 slightly 186:22 187:1 310:20 slow 80:22 small 26:1 36:10 40:11,19 186:20	186:24 188:18 191:5 193:5 251:19 smith 6:14 14:13 14:14 175:16 189:7,10 190:20 192:16 221:7 231:14,15,20 232:24 social 124:23 125:1,12,16 societies 69:1 70:6 society 23:18 77:25 102:23 110:21 117:21 sociologist 125:7,8 125:9 sociology 125:10 sold 52:6 64:9 76:3 77:22 254:2 302:4 303:1,17 solemnly 16:7 solutions 7:4 14:17 somebody 36:2 47:20 76:2 83:7,9 98:5,10 171:12 215:10 242:13 someone's 226:14 226:14 soon 96:23 sorry 28:23 39:24 74:23 75:9 135:14 157:21 172:13 193:16 213:14 237:22 263:15 269:8 287:18,19 298:11,20 307:16 311:11 sort 90:2 102:8 163:22 214:10	311:11 sought 36:1 78:20 79:12 sound 22:7 sounds 186:3 305:12 source 171:14 253:20 259:21 299:20 sources 122:12 131:22,23 157:6 157:18,19 159:2 south 4:15 9:6 191:9 space 284:10,24 284:25 285:1,4,5 sparingly 31:23 32:7 speak 113:13 270:20 271:2 275:22 speakerphone 3:7 3:16 4:5 9:14 speaking 19:13 245:22 253:12 speaks 117:20 specialist 66:10 77:19 213:9 214:22 specialists 44:23 specialties 40:5 65:25 specific 29:13 37:13,21 39:3 40:3 42:12 45:7 45:23 46:14 48:20 49:12 51:9 53:12 54:5 61:21 65:14 82:5 98:19 103:23 113:14 124:15 129:7 130:17	132:13 135:5,5 138:22 142:2 143:14 151:20 159:7 161:14 163:7,11,12 164:15,16,16 165:7,7,11,12 166:2 172:1 174:11,14 175:15 176:21 182:6 183:9 197:1,6 207:24 208:2 228:14 232:3 247:3,8 249:15,18 249:20,25 250:4,6 262:18 268:5 269:25 271:16 274:7 286:19 287:2,3,8,22 290:5 290:20 291:25 292:2 293:2,12 295:21 296:1,3,8 296:25 305:4,11 306:1 308:24 specifically 64:16 64:22 99:21 100:6 115:9 131:12,19 134:12,22 137:13 137:17 140:25 159:21 172:14 173:25 177:9 178:7 180:21 182:23 225:22 235:12 237:5 254:11,21 272:12 272:14 275:22 296:7 303:12 307:18 specificity 96:13 138:18 175:20 249:23 250:10
--	--	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[specificity - stigma]

Page 60

271:23 296:1 specifics 49:8 51:3 62:2 92:1 141:4 164:9 166:16 172:10 201:24 specify 129:10 spectrum 149:25 152:8,15 spell 195:24 spend 234:16 306:13 spending 206:2 spent 24:14 56:15 56:20 57:2,5,9 76:14 145:10 170:16 244:15 306:16 spike 39:3 spikes 39:18 spoke 270:21 spoken 16:19 166:10,13,21,24 272:9 281:25 295:23 sponsored 300:12 spot 84:10 spyser 5:11 square 8:16 ss 316:1 stable 224:9 stamp 257:7 stand 43:10 48:21 132:3 145:6 standard 62:7 90:6,7 94:10 97:14 111:8 191:12 269:16 standards 108:19 110:4 standing 69:10	stands 132:6 243:12 303:25 304:25 305:1 stanford 17:1,4,11 17:12,18,23 47:22 59:11 61:22 92:11 145:22 166:19 209:14 237:8 243:19 244:9,16 stanford's 51:15 staphylococcus 243:13 start 59:3 157:2 268:22 284:23 started 16:16 75:11 78:24 80:17 119:17 123:1 125:25 192:25 240:23 242:9 246:8 248:5 269:6 starting 32:9 state 1:1 2:1 3:15 13:17 14:5 15:9 15:14 16:7,24 21:17,18 26:23,25 55:8 66:14 69:1 70:10 84:12 86:22 94:6 99:2,5,14,20 99:23 100:20,22 100:25 101:1,2,4,5 101:12,14,24 102:1 103:1,1,10 103:18,25 104:23 104:25 105:6,6,23 106:10,19,22 107:2,6,9 118:1 130:24 131:1,7,21 132:7,10 139:9,12 143:23 144:16 161:6,16 172:12 172:22 173:19,20	174:11,17,22 175:1 196:14,23 202:17 204:8 205:16,25 207:13 248:1,1,20 249:5 254:16,22 255:2,8 271:10,15,18 275:24 278:16,21 278:22 279:8,23 280:21,25 281:9 281:13 293:8 294:6,14 303:15 309:12,16,19 316:1 state's 100:3 stated 31:8 80:7 194:11 196:7 253:3 274:8 278:18 283:11 304:17 statement 36:8 43:7 58:3,6 108:8 129:14 132:19 136:23 183:11 184:10 201:25 202:20 203:10,19 205:3,9,13 212:23 236:14 238:12 252:20 266:22,23 278:9 299:19 311:1,3,18,24 312:10,16,17,23 313:1,11,15,19 statements 58:14 58:21,23 59:1,2,2 59:3,4 60:3 128:6 133:1 277:21 278:4 290:1,8,12 290:17 291:1 states 28:5,13 29:1 31:16 34:14 56:4	70:20 71:1,8 84:5 100:5 101:7 116:10 120:9 162:9 163:23 183:21 186:7 189:23 190:1 196:19 204:8 237:22 251:24 252:7 261:10 269:4,9,10,15 271:15 294:20 statewide 144:15 stating 103:2 183:12 194:14 196:7 222:21 223:25 235:16 statistic 149:4 156:3,5 statistical 153:7 statistics 151:7,13 151:18 153:14 154:8 169:19 174:21 218:15 status 120:20 stay 241:16 steer 214:12 stems 196:1 stenographically 316:11 stepping 119:2 steps 81:3 steve 14:8 steven 5:6 22:3 steward 95:18 209:24 stewards 34:22 stewardship 36:6 92:20 stigma 197:23 243:25
--	--	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[stimulate - support]

Page 61

stimulate 203:6 stock 50:13 stocked 84:3 stolen 75:3 stone 119:2 stop 45:1 58:19 213:16 307:16 storage 181:14 story 243:24 245:4 straight 243:24 strategies 214:8 strategy 305:2 street 2:15 3:8 4:15 5:7 6:6,16 7:8 77:22 254:3 strengths 261:3 263:24 264:1 strike 25:15 30:24 41:21 46:8 56:19 71:6 79:25 84:20 89:6 97:2 99:9 109:23 123:15 133:4,19 136:21 259:3 314:8,11 strong 118:16 structural 42:20 177:13 179:23 struggling 124:23 209:12 students 59:6 64:6 studied 136:7 142:4,7,8 studies 28:25 74:14 185:24 187:7 233:8 265:9 265:13 267:2 285:10 study 60:9,9,11,15 102:21 118:1,11 123:3 187:9 190:5 234:2,22 236:4	265:12,21 266:24 267:6,6 298:14,22 studying 60:1 75:1 subject 142:6 167:4 189:23 subjective 189:20 189:23 190:13 284:20 subjects 158:10 submitted 18:12 18:18 20:8 41:4 41:14 145:13 282:4 subscribed 315:22 316:20 subsequent 88:4 subset 73:24 subsets 40:19 subsidiaries 299:18 subsidiary 299:21 301:9 substance 59:13 99:24 117:12 146:21 147:13,20 149:2 151:11 158:20 197:17 224:14 227:8,11 229:3,5 233:1 substances 25:12 93:7 100:7 153:25 159:6 193:15,23 substantial 162:8 substantive 142:11,21 substitute 225:22 substitution 297:1 successful 297:10 sucking 304:19 sudden 124:24	suddenly 65:12 sued 106:22 231:6 suffer 52:12 152:24 suffered 165:24 suffering 86:11 109:8 245:2 sufficient 39:22 148:17,24 158:22 181:17 183:18 218:15 285:11 suffolk 1:2 2:2 13:17 54:25 55:2 84:1,4,8,14,23 85:20 86:14 130:11,25 131:16 131:20 132:14 133:23 134:7,25 135:6 136:5,8,15 137:7 138:3,8,20 139:21 140:1,17 141:8 143:16,21 144:5,12 158:6,16 159:12 160:6,9,13 160:17,21 161:1 161:10,15,23 162:6,14 163:8,17 166:4 278:25 279:14 280:21,25 281:10,14 293:8 293:14 296:9,19 303:4 309:15,19 suggest 53:20 91:21 123:21 299:7 suggested 108:21 256:14 269:9 suggesting 28:7 156:10 264:11 suggests 122:24	suite 2:15 3:8,17 4:6 5:17 6:16 9:6 sulfate 246:25 summa 17:17 sun 85:7 86:4 super 240:21 241:22 242:20,21 superior 13:16 supervision 316:12 supplement 275:12,20 276:4 276:17,24 278:6 supplemental 11:9 66:25 67:5,9,18 68:4 256:25 supply 22:25 23:8 23:13,25 24:3,4,9 24:18 25:3 26:6,8 26:19 30:6 33:6 33:11 34:6,7,11 35:7,14,15,19 36:5 36:9 56:19 57:11 57:14,24 77:18 78:3 81:8 83:23 84:16,17 91:12,15 91:25 113:11,22 119:6 122:15 128:21 133:13,14 134:2 135:3 137:5 137:8,14 139:17 165:3 168:3 180:9 209:25 236:2 243:17 245:11 251:23 252:5,9,17 252:23 253:13 297:19 302:20 303:9 support 36:16 62:5 102:13 111:9 119:11 148:18
---	---	---	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[support - tell]

Page 62

185:22 187:20 188:14 267:10 298:13 299:2 supported 187:3 265:8 298:13 299:2,8,14 supposed 39:9 91:7 92:5 supreme 1:1 2:1 sure 20:4 30:6 41:13 47:15 48:23 52:19 53:18 55:12 66:19 85:3 100:2 101:9 105:5 115:24 128:21 129:15 130:6 141:24 142:16 156:19 172:17,20 184:13 204:3 217:19,23 229:6 239:2 240:19 242:24 251:18 264:2 268:8 269:3 289:24,24 291:7 297:4 301:25 305:18 311:13 surgery 244:7 surrounded 266:6 survey 118:2 123:3 174:13 175:5,12,19 190:5 surveyed 175:13 surveys 111:18 112:11,20,25 113:5 204:20 suspect 95:10 105:21 suspected 96:9 97:7 211:15 212:14,19 214:15 216:7 218:8,11	221:14 suspicion 39:6 96:5 212:21 213:23 216:3,11 216:24 217:11,15 218:1 suspensions 96:6,11 98:15 suspicious 25:18 34:21 39:14,14 89:3,17 91:3,14 96:8,8 97:5,6,10 170:24 171:3,6,10 211:24 212:4 250:1 274:2,5,12 274:17,21 283:14 suspiciousness 96:23 sustained 313:6,17 swapping 237:23 swear 16:3 sweeping 201:23 swift 6:5 14:13 switch 181:7 297:7 297:16 298:3 306:17 switches 297:11 switching 146:3 161:21 297:22 sworn 43:10 315:22 symptoms 192:19 syndrome 37:3 synonymous 313:7,18 system 149:1 159:6 161:7 171:14 198:25 209:6 216:22 251:11,15,17 274:18	systematic 130:20 systems 171:10 198:20,22,23,24 274:2,6,22 t table 21:25 120:11 120:17 121:10 tables 62:6 tablets 244:17 261:3,19 take 13:25 18:7 50:16 55:11 59:8 61:2 66:3 74:21 81:3 88:24 90:4 90:16 94:25 100:13 101:21 126:24 135:14 145:6 149:12 152:11,19 153:20 156:14 183:19,25 215:2,3,5,19 216:1 216:1,2 217:21 223:2 256:22 262:14 264:13 269:16 271:19 305:5 314:17 taken 2:13 13:13 25:3,6,6,10 98:4 114:17 115:11 153:9,24 185:2 204:23 231:16 281:24 282:2 315:4 316:7 takes 266:24 talk 22:4 29:7 64:7 76:25 98:18 107:5 111:22 114:19 120:13 137:13 179:12 182:5 187:19 188:21 210:4,19 214:7	218:17 233:16 talked 57:11 65:15 86:24 140:24 159:22 196:10 199:4 204:19 211:6 238:20 241:4 251:10 talking 19:16 34:25 56:18 65:5 69:24,25 70:3,7,11 76:16 115:15 196:14 214:23 216:2 225:10 232:2,3,18 233:7 235:7 talks 59:5 107:5 140:22 234:7 267:19 tapentadol 251:9 260:5,7 265:15 266:17 taper 44:24 46:2 46:25,25 tapering 45:22,23 tapers 165:17 task 112:16 taught 17:11 63:23 94:12 163:20 194:18 teach 169:12 teaching 17:12 58:20 195:4 team 97:13 217:1 teenager 72:7 teenagers 74:20 75:25 telephonic 14:3 telephonically 15:7 tell 46:18 48:19 49:5,23 50:25
--	--	---	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[tell - thoroughly]

Page 63

95:15 132:6	terms 32:19 35:18	250:13 272:16	122:3 124:4,15
164:18 193:18	39:4 76:21 111:11	273:24 285:16	127:1 135:1 137:7
200:18 210:14,16	123:13 162:11	288:11 303:11	141:20 142:5,20
212:20 223:17	174:23 175:2	307:12 309:23	163:1 164:22
237:22 243:20	201:18 203:25	313:22 314:22	165:2,14,21 169:5
268:8 282:17,20	204:8,19 234:1	thanks 285:20	171:5,11 176:5
290:1,25 292:4	235:8 249:9	theft 87:8,12,16,19	177:20 183:2
301:7 304:25	269:12 275:22	themes 203:4	184:10 186:14,23
308:11	test 158:23 159:1,2	289:3	188:17 189:19,22
telling 76:6 105:8	190:18 216:17	theory 146:5	191:3 194:16,24
105:24 182:7	219:17 221:13	therapy 54:2	194:25 195:3,7,19
219:15 307:12	testified 91:1	114:22 152:25	196:22 198:5
temperature	102:13 136:17	180:20 181:13	199:5 200:6 201:9
110:14 111:7	141:11 149:23	185:22 186:2	207:18 208:9,9
ten 212:10,12,16	152:6 208:25	187:3 189:6,10	209:20 211:12
220:9 261:10,17	282:13 292:14	190:6,22,25 191:4	214:9 215:9
263:1	testify 145:2,8	203:14,16 222:7	218:23 219:12,12
tend 212:7	testifying 19:24	222:10,22 223:2	220:25 222:24,24
tender 167:5	91:9 145:21	224:5 225:11,11	223:13,15 224:2
tens 115:15,17	166:13,21 168:1	225:14 226:12,20	225:9 226:10,14
124:10 195:9	168:18 169:1	229:4 234:9 236:2	232:4 235:1 236:9
tense 283:13	testimony 43:5,11	241:16 283:20	238:1 242:20
term 53:18,19,23	91:5,24 125:23	284:4,11 298:6,6	243:4 245:3
54:2 68:12 112:5	128:13 132:24	thereof 316:19	247:19,21 252:2,8
142:16 153:5,6	144:20,21 166:10	thing 35:15 50:1	252:15 258:3,5
171:20 182:3,7,8	251:12,25 253:16	68:14,18 216:15	259:24 263:10
183:1,10,10	256:16 277:4,8	258:21	265:8 266:1 267:6
186:21 187:3,6,17	293:4 314:8,11	things 79:7 89:14	267:8,13,15 269:5
188:19,22 189:3	315:4,6 316:6,9,14	109:7 119:8 183:8	269:19,24 279:12
190:6 196:2	testing 216:18	229:2 230:21	279:25 280:4
225:10,11,14	teva 9:3 15:2	245:8 252:15	288:21 289:4,8
226:11,11,20	287:18 301:3,9	265:20	293:8 306:5,9,22
228:5 253:8,13	308:2,20	think 20:5,7 35:12	312:10,15 313:12
255:11 266:8	text 76:8 238:1	37:5 38:3,14	thinking 63:10,15
283:19 298:6,7	thank 15:16,20	54:12 65:16 71:25	63:18 65:13
305:2	16:2,11 90:18,19	72:16 80:10,14	209:24
termed 242:5	101:23 127:11	81:7 83:15 88:12	third 88:3,5 181:5
terminal 146:9	156:22 157:12	89:13,13,14 91:22	211:9 243:10
terminology	167:7 184:18	104:3 106:13	252:8
110:19	234:21 239:16	110:20 113:12	thoroughly 79:21
	241:20 247:23	115:23,25 119:24	277:17

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[thought - travels]

Page 64

thought 77:11 85:4,23,24 163:24 240:25 thoughts 183:4 thousands 61:19 162:13 201:7 288:18 three 7:17 40:15 54:2,8,16 90:10 117:15 123:3 165:16 174:20 224:9 239:25 240:22 241:2 243:6 244:9,15 283:24 285:15 298:3 300:1 301:22 302:4,11 303:1,17 threshold 97:22 188:20 216:24 thursday 1:16 2:16 10:4 13:1 tide 77:17 137:17 tied 89:14 252:15 time 13:10 15:12 17:22,24 19:24 20:12 45:5 48:7 55:14,16 57:2,5,6 57:9 59:21 62:21 63:2,6,25 64:25 66:2 71:3 77:5 79:1,7,10,19,20,24 80:17,21 90:21,23 93:21 101:21 122:10 127:6,8,11 131:7,9 136:12,13 144:23,25 145:2,4 145:8 146:11 148:24 151:2 153:10 158:19 159:6 167:3,5,7,12	167:15 169:6 180:23 186:22 188:19 199:4 206:2 210:11 215:22,24 216:22 223:2 226:24 227:1 230:5,6 234:16,18 236:18 236:22 239:12,14 240:24 241:8 244:13 245:1 250:13,16 251:1 255:5 264:14,25 266:20 272:19 276:9 283:12 285:10,14,17,22 286:3 300:22,24 306:13,16 307:17 308:15 310:1,3 314:23 316:7,8,10 times 86:24 118:5 122:20 200:23 201:6 208:22 225:14 235:18,19 251:22 252:3 timing 265:20 tiny 193:6 tirf 303:19,22 304:3,11,23 305:3 305:8,13,19 307:11 title 17:4 104:12 titled 266:12 today 27:21 35:4 42:14 46:17 57:1 57:6,8 78:14 123:14,23 124:14 124:17 125:23 126:16 127:18 128:17 132:18 137:21 164:18	166:1 177:21 200:14 241:15 242:12 251:11 253:16 254:17 256:13 276:10,22 282:13 292:5 299:13,23 310:9 today's 22:23 23:6 23:11 126:13 314:19 told 49:2 51:10 174:18 tolerability 202:24 tolerance 194:2,13 196:2 230:7,8 241:17 244:6 297:17 313:5,16 tolerant 304:7 tolerate 268:24 tool 53:20 229:11 tools 222:12,15 228:21,23 top 237:7 240:9,12 243:5 261:10 topic 58:20 60:6 201:17 topics 183:15 total 28:8,20 56:2 297:18,21 totality 267:8 town 251:19 towns 26:1 125:1 125:12,17 193:6 tox 211:25 216:5 219:6,17 221:13 toxicology 158:19 tr 149:21 track 65:21 89:15 89:25 91:2,7,18 92:5	tracked 139:15 tracking 311:24 tracks 62:16 trade 260:17 tradename 260:5 260:6 trained 63:12 125:9,9 198:11 213:2 training 43:22 63:16 67:23,25 93:20 95:1 142:12 142:18,21 143:1,4 151:23 169:9,15 169:18 197:22 200:1 204:1,8 209:2 213:5,13 269:23 282:9 287:14 304:14 transcribed 316:12 transcript 43:1 315:3 transcription 225:1 237:18 transdermal 251:8 transfer 88:5 transition 269:17 transitioned 45:3 transitioning 269:1 transmucosal 303:25 305:3 306:4 trauma 227:24 travel 144:23,25 145:1,2,3,4 traveled 159:22 traveling 76:15 travels 173:21
--	--	--	---

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[treat - typically]

Page 65

treat 43:13,24,25 44:3 148:13 231:8 232:8 237:9 244:1 244:5 253:22 255:25 treated 32:6 48:4 109:21 122:7 196:12,16 201:5 202:16 224:20 225:5,25 226:5 304:16 treating 32:14 103:19,22 111:1,3 111:15 204:11 treatment 23:22 23:24 31:14 32:11 40:14 41:2 44:1 44:14 53:16,21 60:19 61:11 66:8 83:4 95:23 97:13 102:19 103:5,13 105:7,10,16,24 108:19 114:22 119:15 138:12 146:14,17,22,22 146:24 147:7,8,21 149:13 164:2 175:3 180:25 181:2 185:12,23 187:6 188:23 189:25 198:4,17 199:3 201:3,19 202:1,6 209:9 214:8 230:13 244:22 262:5 263:6 265:15 267:1 268:16 282:11,13 306:11 310:10,22 312:8 treatments 93:15 214:11	treats 47:20 146:21 trial 144:21 145:1 145:12 206:3 261:24 262:11 276:16,23 283:24 284:3,10,24,25 285:1,4,5 trials 166:14 187:4 187:5 263:5 265:14 tried 66:19 123:21 194:7 278:10 trouble 241:18 311:22,23 trucks 34:19 true 18:22 30:12 46:22 99:8 102:20 104:2,3 110:7 132:21 133:8 134:6 146:12 148:5,7 181:25 184:2 193:13,21 203:19 217:13 221:11,18 225:16 239:4 248:7 267:12 282:16 285:11 310:10,13 310:19 315:5 316:13 truly 49:14 truth 16:8,9,9 152:5 try 50:3 64:25 77:23 95:22 116:3 122:5 147:15 148:1 170:13 211:14 248:12 259:25 282:1 284:5,6,10,18 292:15 293:11	297:7,16 300:10 trying 32:14 73:20 76:16 90:8 94:21 139:22 148:14 153:17 219:21 234:11 244:8 258:25 265:20 290:19 296:25 tsai 7:16 10:10 14:20,20 167:18 168:16,21,24 169:5 170:4 172:17 173:13,22 174:13 175:12,21 176:16 177:24 178:13,19,25 179:14 180:1,11 181:7 182:16 183:6 184:4,15,25 186:16,25 188:1,7 188:10 189:3 190:18 192:4,22 194:10,24 195:24 196:6 199:20 201:4,10,25 202:9 202:20 203:9,21 205:2,10 206:6,15 207:4 212:14 214:23 215:2,12 215:20 216:1 217:4,25 218:7,17 219:5,11 220:8,13 220:22,25 221:8 222:4 223:24 225:3,22 226:14 227:3 229:1 230:17 232:12 233:16,20 234:10 235:6,25 236:9,12 236:16,24 238:11 238:20 239:10,16	246:12 247:21 248:15 250:5,11 tsunami 77:17 137:16 242:8 243:16 245:19,25 252:3 253:4 tuesday 48:10 145:8,11 turn 22:14 31:10 59:4 120:10 191:9 202:23 239:19 257:21 265:24 266:3 286:14 307:20 308:9 turned 35:25,25 turning 30:20 243:13 253:19 286:12 twelfth 5:7 two 42:19 48:11 80:16 116:25 194:22 232:13 239:24 240:22 241:2,12 243:2 264:12 265:19 270:4,4 271:25 308:25 309:3 tylenol 185:24 type 40:3 140:5 143:3 183:10 234:13 292:15,17 292:22 types 37:7 38:6 40:16 77:14 90:10 93:14 108:9 142:2 284:8 typically 44:12 95:15 197:10 214:4,5,7 230:6
---	---	--	--

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[ubiquitous - users]

Page 66

u	290:24 306:20	252:7 269:4,9,10	120:23 121:1,3,4
ubiquitous 243:17	307:10 308:15	269:15	121:11,13,14,24
245:12	310:15 312:15	units 28:6,9	122:8,21 123:18
uh 88:17 120:12	understanding	universal 203:4	146:21 147:13
120:22,22,25	24:18 31:3 33:13	university 17:1,16	149:6,7,11,15,24
121:2,6,9 144:22	33:16,17,20 34:3	17:24 64:21 69:11	149:25 150:4,7,16
148:21 155:12,20	92:21 135:15	unnecessary 208:1	151:6,11 152:8,12
155:25 167:24	171:20 175:2	unpaid 145:16	152:14,17,20,23
184:15 205:20	183:7 203:20	170:7	153:11,15 154:5
221:2 234:4	238:11 257:25	unquote 28:9	154:14 155:9,16
238:24 266:14	264:13 267:2	109:5,9 230:10	155:22 156:16
284:17 300:14	273:25 287:16	unused 74:5 81:3	157:7,8 158:4,10
ultimate 267:3	288:17	81:4 88:24	158:20,24 175:3
ultimately 64:21	understood 85:22	unusual 65:23	180:20,25 181:2
203:9 267:11	231:11 259:25	162:8	183:1 184:7
umbrella 101:2	263:10 269:8	update 199:9	185:22 187:14,17
umm 209:22	293:10	urge 103:18	187:20 188:14,19
unavailable 86:16	undoubtedly	urging 76:17	194:7 197:17,19
unaware 138:16	154:25	urine 77:5,8 93:3	198:4,8 201:3
138:21	unemployed	95:10,11 96:12,17	210:25 222:11,14
uncertain 313:12	231:23 233:5	210:1 216:5,12	223:11,23 225:17
uncomfortable	unfolded 276:9	221:13	225:21 227:8,11
82:5	unfortunately	usa 301:4 308:2,20	227:20 228:20,22
uncommon 122:14	62:7 111:9	usage 264:19	229:3,5,8,10,13,17
310:11,23	unfounded 96:12	use 11:16 37:4	229:25 231:23,23
undercount	unintentionally	47:1,2,2,3 53:18	232:8,22 233:1,2
197:20	72:7	59:13 68:12,24	234:12 235:17,19
undercover	union 155:22	76:11 81:9 87:4	235:20,21,22,23
170:12	156:7	90:1 98:22,24	236:3 241:2,16
undercut 258:12	unique 35:8,13,15	104:9 111:10	242:2,3,15 244:13
underestimate	35:20 36:25 38:15	114:21,22 116:9	245:2,6,7,24
155:8	45:18 53:22 54:13	116:12,14,16,17	246:18 253:17,17
undergraduate	91:13 153:3	116:18,20,21,25	260:16 265:2
17:16	united 28:5,13	117:1,4,6,7,9,10	268:16 278:10
understand 72:19	29:1 31:16 34:14	117:11,11,12,16	282:1,11,13 284:5
85:17,19 105:5	56:4 70:20 71:1,8	118:2,4,5,7,9,10	284:18,22 298:7
113:19 139:11	84:5 116:10 120:9	118:13,13,15,15	304:21 313:7,17
175:6 184:13	162:9 163:23	118:17,17,18,22	useful 53:20 54:12
223:19 248:12	183:21 186:6	118:25 119:3,3,3,5	171:13 241:14
254:1 258:7	189:22 190:1	119:7,18 120:8,8	users 118:21
259:10,15 290:15	204:8 251:24	120:18,20,20,23	119:17 123:4,8,10

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[users - way]

Page 67

123:13 242:11 uses 258:20 307:11 usual 217:24 usually 210:17 305:25 utility 37:4	285:16 video 13:24 videographer 9:21 13:9,22 14:4 15:6 15:11,16,20,24 16:2,12 55:13,16 90:20,23 127:5,8 167:9,11,15 215:21,24 226:23 227:1 236:17,22 239:11,14 250:15 251:1 272:18,21 285:21 286:3 300:21,24 309:25 310:3 314:19 videotaped 1:14 2:12 13:12 314:20 view 150:9,13 151:3 204:7 vigilance 39:2 191:6,19,22,23 203:24 232:11 vigilant 34:22 38:11,16,18 violated 137:2 violation 51:8 vis 36:6,6 113:15 113:15 137:9,9 141:1,1 visit 93:3 visual 111:10 vital 110:8,11,12 110:15,19,23 111:2,3,15 275:24 312:21,24 vogel 9:13 15:22 volume 39:15 40:6 89:4 106:12 244:19 volumes 25:21 26:16 27:4 38:20	106:16 193:6 voluntary 147:19 147:24 149:1 voucher 261:23,24 vulnerability 26:8 93:24 vulnerable 192:8 192:10	213:17 219:18 234:16 235:4 239:9 240:7 249:2 256:18 276:12 291:6,10 299:11 299:19 306:1 313:25 wanted 80:21 86:15 144:20 188:7 196:11 213:14 215:8 236:24 237:20 244:3 wants 78:2 warning 80:5,7 247:7,8 266:8,9,12 warnings 266:5 washington 5:8 21:17,18 28:10,18 190:4 water 255:20,22 256:3 watson 301:5,19 302:8 waves 252:9 way 32:6 35:16 37:25 38:15 40:1 52:19 82:10 83:1 83:15,24 84:21 85:9 86:5 90:3,6,8 93:18,19 95:9 103:4 108:16 110:17,17 116:22 137:2 142:23 148:1 149:8 162:8 163:19 164:22 171:18 193:17 194:10 202:16 203:5,6 206:1,1 209:4 212:5 215:18 223:17
v	w		
v 62:14 vacuum 204:16 vague 142:16 168:13 validated 109:20 value 137:22 vanco 244:14 variation 54:18 203:2 294:20 varies 269:19 various 33:12 36:4 154:9 252:3 258:25 299:18 vary 202:21 269:24 vast 182:2 186:23 205:18,19,23 verify 59:14 214:2 299:20 300:4 veritext 13:21,23 version 87:22 122:4 153:11 260:23,25 263:16 263:25 264:8 versus 135:17 145:21 234:9 237:1 269:13 vial 241:6 vicari 7:7 10:12 14:16,16 272:23 272:24 273:17,24 276:15 278:13,25 279:14 280:18	waiting 145:8 waiver 209:16 walgreens 6:3 14:13 130:1,4,13 134:13,24 135:2 walk 17:14 244:13 walks 111:4 wall 107:9 walmart 5:14 14:12 127:17 130:1,4,13 133:4,5 133:12,16,20,25 134:1,4,10,12,23 135:2 136:2 137:1 138:15 139:4,18 141:3 want 16:16 27:24 47:15 51:11 54:11 55:11 56:24 85:15 111:25 120:13 128:18 142:14 145:23 146:3 150:8,16 151:1 152:11,12,18 154:12,19,20 155:13 159:15 161:8 162:1 180:1 184:13,16 188:8 188:11 189:4 191:11,18 192:15 193:11 199:9 211:12 212:8,23		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[way - work]

Page 68

230:7,9 232:4	wholesale 24:21	88:12,21 89:2	228:16 230:16
238:10 253:15,16	25:11 41:1	90:19 92:13 94:8	232:1 233:18
258:12 259:25	widely 189:23	95:6 96:2 98:1,18	234:7 235:4,14
274:11 282:1	281:25	99:18 100:2	236:10 238:8
297:19 308:22	wildly 189:21	101:23 113:25	246:7 247:19
310:21 316:18	willful 148:14	114:14 115:22	250:4,13,14
ways 87:3 91:21	william 240:23	116:16 117:3	251:17 252:20
107:11,12 108:21	williams 5:4 14:7	119:21 120:2	254:5 255:18,22
140:11 203:2	14:9	123:20 124:3	259:13,21 262:17
208:9 245:8 249:7	willing 186:19	126:25 127:12	262:25 265:5
258:15 273:8	219:22 270:9,21	133:25 135:10	268:5 269:3
wc.com 5:10,11	270:22,22,24	143:3 145:10	270:19 271:23
we've 16:21 55:10	window 280:1	146:8 147:2 148:7	272:4,17 276:6
73:7 77:25 124:9	wis 12:2 286:1	150:12 151:17	278:8,18 279:11
127:2 169:5 189:3	wisconsin 102:22	153:13 156:22	280:14 285:17,19
230:7 234:24	298:14 299:8	162:1,17 163:11	288:25 289:13
weak 266:25	wise 163:15	163:15 164:8	295:16 296:12
wednesday 145:7	wish 276:21	165:11 166:16	297:3,15 298:1
week 46:23 54:8	withdraw 157:23	167:5,8 168:15,22	299:17 300:19
84:25 90:3 92:15	291:21	172:16 173:12,16	302:18 303:3,22
92:23 170:9	withdrawal	174:10 175:10,19	305:11 310:13,18
265:12	240:25	176:12 177:9	310:25 311:10,22
weekly 92:22	witness 10:6,19	178:7,18,24 179:4	312:14 313:10
weeks 53:15 54:2	16:4,10 18:9	179:21 180:8,19	314:7,10 316:8,9
54:16 240:22	19:18,19 21:4,10	182:14,22 183:15	316:20
244:9 265:15	21:23 24:12 27:6	184:12,24 186:14	witnesses 128:14
weigh 53:23	29:18 31:8 32:18	186:19 187:24	277:5,9
204:10 262:18	34:1,11 35:12	188:17 189:12	woefully 198:9
weighing 81:19	37:13,16,21 39:13	191:3,22 192:21	wolf 3:6 15:3,3
welcome 127:12	41:12 42:11,19	194:4,16 195:3,25	wonder 240:12
167:8 250:14	45:14 46:13,22	199:19 201:1,9,22	wondered 200:21
wendy 237:2	47:9 48:10 49:7	202:5,13 203:1,18	wondering 310:18
238:12	49:12 50:1 51:15	204:14 205:9	word 79:6 241:22
went 49:21 63:12	52:1 53:12,18	206:11,25 212:12	310:19
102:25 240:24	54:5,11 56:13	214:19 215:7,17	words 79:17
241:3 242:13	57:17 58:1 59:8	216:11 217:18	177:22 217:11
west 6:6 7:8	67:21 70:23 71:12	218:10,23 219:20	230:25 235:21
whereof 316:20	71:19 73:1,17	220:12,20 221:6	297:5
whispers 14:2	74:8 75:8 79:5	221:23 223:13	work 42:3,5 45:25
white 240:21	80:5 81:7,17 82:4	224:25 225:9	46:5,22 47:4,16
	82:18 85:17 86:19	226:10,16,19	48:20 64:20 66:4

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

[work - à]

Page 69

94:21 101:14 128:15 140:22 145:20,21 151:25 164:11,15 165:15 166:25 170:12 182:4 185:17 186:7,17 189:8 190:14,15 191:17 202:15 235:10 244:2 worked 24:20,23 24:25 147:4 166:7 170:2 222:18 241:7 258:16 270:5 working 56:16,21 60:1 69:12 145:11 169:21 171:11 189:13,15 204:16 214:9 223:18 259:1 works 189:6,6,10 worried 95:12 190:8,11 244:1 worrisome 258:24 worse 46:6 106:4 182:4 189:18 246:15 write 48:25 60:17 62:13 68:22 114:4 124:21 writes 118:20 258:19 writing 58:17 64:23 87:5 178:9 238:23 276:14 written 50:22 59:1 59:4 86:13 140:23 156:9 163:16,18 163:21,23 207:24 249:4,10 250:7	255:16 261:15,17 281:24 291:2 293:17 295:14 wrong 208:16 267:13,15 290:6 314:11 wrote 50:25 59:11 60:13 83:12 138:5 205:16 295:12,21 309:9 x x 10:1 83:20 209:16 xartemis 247:12 247:16 y y 83:20 yale 17:16 yeah 54:24 94:4 98:18 122:3 138:4 157:13 179:16 182:15 193:25 199:14 206:15 207:18 213:18 217:6 220:20 221:8 224:2 226:3 226:16 233:25 247:24 258:5 year 28:17 45:8 56:2 61:7 63:6,11 64:1 65:1 76:24 80:11 113:8 115:1 115:4 120:18 135:21 145:25 187:14 244:4 248:21 years 17:13 24:14 26:6 28:5,19 36:24 45:10 47:23 67:22 76:14 77:4	77:12 78:1 80:16 116:10 122:25 155:18 165:16 189:8 193:8 199:24 202:14 210:15 232:5 260:19 263:1 268:18 285:15 304:15 yep 233:13 298:23 298:25 yield 146:25 york 1:1 2:1 3:15 3:18 4:7 7:9,9 9:16,16 13:17 15:9,14 19:14,15 20:2,6 26:24 27:1 41:9,15,20,24 42:8 42:16,17 54:25 55:5,8 56:11,16,21 57:9 84:12 86:22 94:6,9,25 99:4,5,9 99:10,14,23 100:3 100:8 101:4 103:21 104:5 106:18,21 130:24 131:1,7,21,21 132:10 139:9 143:24 144:16 145:14 159:22,25 161:7,16,18,19 172:9,11,12,19,22 173:4,8,14,17,18 173:21,25 174:5 174:12,14,16,18 174:22,22 175:1,6 175:7,14,24 176:3 176:22 177:7 178:3,22 179:2,19 180:17 186:7 196:11,13,13,16	196:20 197:2,6 205:11,16,25 206:7,17,22 207:2 207:5,9,12,13,15 207:24 235:12 241:5,9 246:3,4,8 246:11 247:17 248:2,5,8,20 249:5 249:17 250:7 254:16,22,24 255:2,9 270:1,2 271:11,15,18 272:6,10 278:15 278:21,22 279:8 279:23 280:21,25 281:9,14 288:9 291:16 292:19 293:1,3,8 294:2,6 294:11,14,23,25 295:6,9,12,18,21 295:24 296:4,9,14 296:16,19 303:14 309:12,15,18 york's 132:7 139:12 young 59:13 84:15 187:11 z z 83:20 zero 116:3 233:10 zukerman 237:2 238:12 à à 36:6 113:15 137:9 141:1
--	---	---	--

New York Code

Civil Practice Law and Rules

Article 31 Disclosure, Section 3116

(a) Signing. The deposition shall be submitted to the witness for examination and shall be read to or by him or her, and any changes in form or substance which the witness desires to make shall be entered at the end of the deposition with a statement of the reasons given by the witness for making them. The deposition shall then be signed by the witness before any officer authorized to administer an oath. If the witness fails to sign and return the deposition within sixty days, it may be used as fully as though signed. No changes to the transcript may be made by the witness more than sixty days after submission to the witness for examination.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE STATE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS
COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.